



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID YOUNG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF THOSE LOST ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of those lost in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

It is hard to believe that so many years have passed since the tragic events of 9/11, since the sadness and loss are so fresh for many throughout this Nation.

The attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and my home State of Pennsylvania stand as the most cowardly and senseless acts of terrorism ever perpetrated against the United States and its citizens.

My family and I continue to solemnly offer our thoughts and prayers for those who were impacted that day. We also salute those who came to aid, those who rushed into the World Trade Center before the towers fell, the first responders at the Pentagon, and the passengers who made the ultimate sacrifice, downing United Flight 93 in Somerset County before it could reach its intended destination.

Among those who lost their lives in the attack on the World Trade Center in New York City was Mary Ellen Tiesi. Mary Ellen was a native of Irvona, Clearfield County, and was working in the South Tower on that morning 14 years ago.

Family members have said that, after the attack, Mary Ellen was exiting the stairs of the tower with a friend.

She stopped to wait for her boss, who she knew had a heart condition. Her boss eventually took the elevator, but Mary Ellen continued down the stairs.

She did not make it out of the building and was the only Clearfield County native to lose her life in the attacks in New York. Three years ago the Pennsylvania Route 53 bridge in Irvona was renamed in her memory.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the kindness Mary Ellen Tiesi showed for her coworker on one of the worst days our Nation has ever known. Let us never forget the thousands like Mary Ellen who truly embody the undying resolve of the American people.

WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I concluded my summer tour of Oregon at the fire control center on the Warm Springs Indian reservation.

Summer was an amazing time in my State. Smoke enveloped downtown Portland and drifted all the way for 270 miles to the south in Medford. As I drove past, into central Oregon, the Crater Lake National Park consumed 25 square miles.

Throughout the West, 8.5 million acres have already been burned this year. And like we hear almost every year, the 2015 fire season is one of the worst on record.

We should acknowledge the amazing men and women who are on the front lines and the tremendous strain they bear.

We need so many people that we have actually had active military personnel brought online for the first time in a decade. Even firefighters from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada have come to assist in these efforts.

One cannot say enough about the tremendous bravery and sheer hard work involved on so many levels with the men and women who are literally putting their lives on the line for this heroic fight.

But it is important to note that we are not just decimating our forests. We are decimating the Forest Service budget. The portion of the overall budget spent on fighting wildfires has grown in the last 20 years from 16 percent to over one-half, 52 percent.

Because Congress refuses to treat wildfires like other natural disasters, the Forest Service budget is being consumed, squeezing out other critical areas, not just maintaining these special places and trails and recreational opportunities, but even the efforts that

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5869

would deal with forest health and reduce the danger and the cost of future wildfires.

The trend is that two-thirds of the budget in the next 10 years will be firefighting. Absolutely, totally unacceptable.

These fires ought to be treated like any other natural disaster, not decimate our ability to manage our national forests.

The people dealing with these megafires know that part of the problem is climate change making itself felt. Less than 2 percent of these megafires consume almost one-third of the total fire suppression costs because our forests are drier.

There is less snow and rainfall, one more graphic reminder of the devastating impact of climate change, with higher temperatures and less water.

It is past time that Congress steps up to reduce carbon emissions. Perhaps the Pope in 2 weeks will inspire us to do something about climate change.

But, in the meantime, we should at least pass H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Act—bipartisan legislation introduced on the very first day of this Congress, but languishing in committee—that would treat megafires like other natural disasters, not discriminate against the Forest Service.

One final point is that we should stop making the problem worse by allowing more and more people to move into the fire zone in the wildland-urban interface and give these people the illusion that somehow they are going to be provided with urban-level fire protection. Sixty percent of the new homes since 1990 have been built in the flame zone.

We should stop this madness because we are putting more people at risk not just to their properties and their families, but also the men and women who fight forest fires to protect structures.

Remember the 19 hotshots who were killed in Arizona a couple years ago who lost their lives trying to save homes that probably shouldn't have been there in the first place?

Commonsense budgeting, fighting climate change, and reasonable land use will reduce costs, protect lives, and allow us to begin spending money on prevention, which will, in turn, reduce further costs. It more than pays for itself.

Sensible budgeting, prevention, sound land use planning, will protect people and our forests, along with our budgets, while we start our long overdue actions to reduce carbon pollution.

It is time that Congress steps up to start addressing these problems now. This is not rocket science.

MINNESOTA'S BEST BAGGER GOES TO THE SIXTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate

Lauren Gillson of St. Cloud for her first place win in the Minnesota Grocers Association 2015 Best Bagger Contest, which took place at the Mall of America last month.

I would also like to commend the Minnesota Grocers Association for hosting this competition. It demonstrates how much value they place on providing excellent customer service.

Anyone who visits a grocery store will understand just how crucial a bagger's role is to the industry. They are, by far, one of the most memorable employees in the store, as they are the last person to be in contact with the customer. A bagger can often make or break the customer's overall experience.

Lauren competed against nine others before winning first place. Her win is truly impressive, as she has only worked at Lunds & Byerlys in St. Cloud for less than a month.

I wish Lauren good luck as she competes in the 2016 National Grocers Association Best Bagger Championship this February.

LIVE UNTIL THE DAY YOU DIE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Davis for all that he has done to help those affected by cancer.

Over the past 4 months, Jim has flown throughout the continental United States and given free plane rides to cancer survivors and patients. By sharing his passion for flying, Jim has brought comfort and everlasting memories to these individuals in their time of need.

What truly is amazing about Jim's story is that he is going through a similar situation as the people he is helping.

After being diagnosed with liver cancer and given just 9 months to live, Jim decided that he wasn't going to give up. Instead, he made it his mission to help others affected by this terrible disease.

Jim has said, "Some people get a cancer diagnosis and just sit and wait to die. Not me. I want to live. Cancer patients, live until the day you die."

Jim, I want to thank you for your amazing acts of kindness. I am in awe of your positive attitude and capacity for helping others.

MINNESOTA IS PROUD OF HER VETERANS

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the individuals from my district who were recently recognized for Veterans' Voices Awards.

I am proud to recognize State Representative Bob Dettmer of Forest Lake, Minnesota; Ralph Donais of Elk River; Jim Tuorila of St. Cloud; Megan Allen of Ramsey; Scott Glew of Elk River; and Shelby Marie Hadley of Rice.

These awards are given to individuals who have nobly served their country in the Armed Forces and gone on to volunteer in their communities after returning home.

Each one of these incredible men and women, chosen by the Minnesota Humanities Center, has positively impacted the United States and Minnesota's Sixth District in a major way.

There is so much to thank these individuals for. Thank you for defending our country and for realizing that there was still so much to be accomplished once you returned home. Your work has not gone unnoticed, and we are forever grateful.

THREE AMERICAN HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the three young men from Sacramento County who have deep roots in my district and whose quick thinking onboard a train to Paris saved lives and inspired our country.

Alek Skarlatos, Anthony Sadler, and Spencer Stone sprang into action to stop a man wielding a gun and a box cutter onboard their train. The childhood friends were on vacation when the gunman burst into their cabin.

As an Oregon Army National Guardsman, Army Specialist Alek Skarlatos had recently returned from a tour in Afghanistan. He was the first to sound the alarm, telling his friends, "Let's go," as they moved to subdue the gunman.

Anthony Sadler, a senior at Sacramento State University, and Airman First Class Spencer Stone of the United States Air Force acted without hesitation.

Stone was slashed while trying to disarm the man, but the injury did not stop him. After subduing the gunman, the trained EMT went on to help treat other injured passengers.

These men showed bravery as they put themselves in harm's way to save those around them. Today I commend them and recognize their great service.

A parade in their honor will be held tomorrow in Sacramento. The date September 11 is fitting. They will be welcomed home and honored for their heroism. The story of these three men is a reminder that everyone can be a hero.

Thank you, Alek, Anthony, and Spencer. You have made your hometown proud, and you have made the United States proud.

REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the tragic humanitarian crisis currently underway with the migration of refugees from Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey making their way into Western Europe.

With the unfolding of the horrific conflict in Syria and the continuing grotesque violence of ISIS, we can only

expect that hundreds of thousands more will attempt to flee hostile regions for the safety of Europe and beyond.

Since 2011, at least 4 million Syrians have fled their country, uprooting their families to escape brutal violence and miserable living conditions.

□ 1015

However, the refugees' plight for a safe environment since leaving Syria and escaping to Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey has been bleak.

In just the last few days, we have seen heartbreaking images of refugees making the difficult journey to enter European countries, sometimes paying with their lives. These migrants and refugees will do anything for a better future.

I was proud to see the leadership of Angela Merkel in Germany accepting so many of these people in need. I strongly encourage all European Union countries to follow Chancellor Merkel's lead in welcoming these migrants and refugees and also supporting Germany's efforts in ensuring this undertaking is spread across the continent.

Most importantly, the United States must also offer any humanitarian assistance we can to ensure these vulnerable refugees have all available resources to return to a sense of normalcy. The world must step up, and I hope this Congress will play a role in the process of assisting these refugees.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Syria is one of the great blemishes on human history. Approximately 250,000 people have been killed. This administration said early on that Bashar al-Assad had to go. Nothing happened. The administration then said that, if Mr. Al-Assad used chemical weapons, then he really had to go. The dictator did, gassing innocent people, including children, and the world did nothing.

This is a heavy burden we carry now, and that is why it is essential that we do everything we can to assist these refugees. My parents were refugees; my grandparents were refugees, and the United States took us in and gave us an opportunity. The world must also now account for our failure in Syria and do everything we can to help these innocent people.

WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today, September 10, as World Suicide Prevention Day. Anyone who has been impacted by the horrible tragedy of a suicide, whether it be a family member, friend, or colleague, is well aware of the devastating impact when one person they love takes their own life.

It is critical that we continue the conversation about not only suicide, but mental health issues as well. People of all ages, races, and socioeconomic status can be plagued with mental health problems, and we must ensure those who are suffering receive the proper diagnosis and treatment.

In addition, communities must work together to foster understanding rather

than judgment. If you or a loved one is experiencing difficulties, I encourage you: Please, take the time to seek counseling from a professional.

Every life is worth living, and every life is precious. Let's come together to support our friends and neighbors and work to address mental illness and prevent suicide.

MADURO BORDER CLOSING

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced by Venezuela's de facto dictator, Nicolas Maduro, that the single remaining border crossing with Colombia will be completely bolted.

This action is only the latest example of Maduro's weak attempts to search for phantom scapegoats of his regime's failed economic policies. The figment of Maduro's imagination is Colombians are the cause of food shortages, the collapse of the Venezuelan currency, and his country's rampant crime. As a result, the Venezuelan dictator has ordered the border between Colombia and Venezuela closed.

Colombians living in Venezuela have been unlawfully arrested and have had their homes bulldozed, leaving them with no other option but to flee; but with the latest and final border closure, Colombians are forced to return to their home country using very dangerous routes. This has been dubbed a humanitarian crisis by the United Nations.

Make no mistake, this crackdown by Maduro is a sick and twisted attempt to distract the Venezuelan electorate from Caracas' failed socialist and anti-democratic policies ahead of the December elections.

Unfortunately, the horrible suffering these policies have caused for both Colombian refugees and the Venezuelan people are all too real.

WATER AND DROUGHT IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we come back from the August recess, I would like to speak on an issue that hits very close to home and to the Southwestern States—yes, the Southwestern States—and this is the drought.

The drought in particular that is facing California is the worst one recorded in history in our State, and I believe it will define this era.

My home State is entering its fourth year of consecutive drought, with nearly 93 percent of residents experiencing severe droughts, and there is no foreseeable end in the future.

The lack of water in California is so serious that our Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency and asked that all residents cut back on water 25 percent. Even with us hitting that, a recent study estimates that it will take at least 11 million gallons of water to replenish our drought losses.

Water conservation and infrastructure is a life or death issue, not just for the residents of my district, but for all of California. Without water infrastructure, farmers in the Central Valley cannot adequately grow and sell their crops; the price of foodstuff skyrockets; wildfires rage and destroy acres of property; State energy production is crippled; the economy slows; and the list goes on and on.

While other areas of California are just now setting the initial framework for water conservation and recycling projects, my home district recycles almost 70 percent of the water that we use both in business and at home.

How are we able to do that? Well, when I came here 19 years ago, I championed a project called the Groundwater Replenishment System, and it is located in Orange County. It is the water table underneath our homes.

This system recycles treated waste water into clean drinking water, which exceeds Federal and State standards; and it has produced over 160 trillion gallons of new water and serviced millions of Orange County residents since its creation.

This system has become the largest reclamation project in the world. In fact, people from around the world and from across our great States come to take a look at how we replenish our water supply.

Legislation to fund projects like our groundwater replenishment system—well, it should be commonsense to fund those. However, the drought has continued in the past 4 years, and there has been no meaningful action on infrastructure improvements to move water, to reclaim water, to save water.

While residents of California are feeling the effects of our historic drought, this Chamber continues to stall on meaningful drought relief and water infrastructure legislation. Back in my home district, I have held numerous briefings about the drought and recognized community members who are cutting back and being more efficient with their water.

I recently spent part of this August recess meeting with community members of the Central Valley to discuss water storage and recycling projects.

In this Congress, I have cosponsored the Drought Recovery and Resilience Act of 2015. It is commonsense legislation which addresses innovative water financing, it improves water infrastructure and water management, and it assists in planning for future droughts.

The residents of my State have been doing their part to conserve the water; so now, it is time for Washington, D.C., to help us to do what is right for California and to do what is right for the other Southwestern States.

While the House Republicans are bickering amongst themselves to avoid another embarrassing government shutdown, I will continue to fight for meaningful water infrastructure to secure the water independence of future

generations because with water comes growth and California will grow.

HONORING TYRELL CAMERON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tyrell Cameron, a young man from northeast Louisiana whose life was cut tragically short in an accident on the football field last Friday night.

Tyrell was a bright student at Franklin Parish High School with a promising future, surrounded by a supportive and loving community.

I live about 20 miles from the high school. I consider Winnsboro an extension of my home. I know their people well. I know that this is a strong community that supports each other, helps each other, and loves each other.

As Tyrell's family and friends come to grips with this tragedy, we will mourn; we will grieve, and then we will start the healing process.

While we pray for Tyrell, his family, his teammates, and Franklin Parish, I also ask that you keep the Sterlington community in your prayers. They were on the other sideline during the game, and I know this has been a difficult experience for them as well.

Louisiana is a special place. We love our high school football. Our young men play with heart for their schools every Friday night. As competitive as it can get, we know what is most important. I have been so impressed with the outpouring of support for Tyrell and Franklin Parish that has come from high schools throughout the entire State of Louisiana.

Many local teams will wear Tyrell's number, number 48, on their helmets for the remainder of the season. That says a lot to me about the strong character of our young men back home.

Others like me are wearing blue today, his team color, to honor Tyrell, just as his teammates are doing this week also.

My thoughts and prayers are both with Franklin Parish and Sterlington communities, and I encourage them to keep playing for Tyrell.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, I have come to this floor to urge my colleagues to stand with me against the rampant plague of gun violence spreading across our Nation, and I stand here again heartbroken.

I recently had the difficult and tragic duty of speaking at Tamara Sword's funeral. Tamara was the mother of five and the daughter of Chicago gun violence prevention advocate Andrew Holmes, a personal hero of mine.

Andrew is a man who has dedicated his life to preventing gun violence and supporting families of gun violence victims. For decades, he has traveled to hundreds of crime scenes to console those who lost friends and family members. In a cruel twist of fate, he was the one who needed consoling when Tamara was caught in the crossfire while at a gas station.

I wish Tamara's story was an exception, but we know it is not. It is a tragic reminder that only in America does an everyday trip to the gas station, the movie theater, or church end in gun violence or maybe you are a reporter and a photographer just doing your job or a sheriff filling your car with gas.

All across America, gun violence is surging. More than 30 cities are reeling from a summer of senseless shootings, with death tolls reaching historic levels. In Chicago last week, we marked the highest number of gun homicides in a single day in more than a decade.

After each mass shooting, Congress launches into its ritual that is used as an end run around real reform. We give our speeches; we hold our moments of silence, and then we wait for the national buzz to fade.

My colleagues seem to forget that our actions may fade, but the violence remains. Violence—gun violence—is a major public health problem in the United States. Every moment that we don't act, we risk losing even more lives to senseless gun violence, which might be homicides, suicides, or accidents.

Last week, I hosted a dinner for a group of parents who lost their children to senseless gun violence. They think we simply do not care. They wonder. There has been Newtown; there is Hadiya Pendleton; there is the church shooting, movie theaters, the mall, but still, we do nothing.

Today, I rise again on behalf of victims of gun violence. I rise to say that we can no longer dismiss the mass shootings as isolated incidents and ignore everyday shootings altogether because the fact is, when our Nation is averaging one mass shooting a day, they aren't so isolated. When shootings are so commonplace that they are called everyday shootings, they cannot be ignored.

□ 1030

Over the Labor Day weekend, 9 people were killed and 34 were wounded by gun violence in Chicago. It is time that we own up to the gun violence problem that is gripping our Nation and robbing us of a generation of young people one shooting at a time.

This year, for the first time in history, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death of Americans aged 15 through 24, and the suicide rate is climbing, also. The future of our Nation is hanging in the balance here.

It is time for Congress to act. There are a number of gun violence reform bills that truly make sense and that are truly bipartisan.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and to take action, because the American people are on the side of gun violence reform that makes sense.

The other thing you can do is to try attending a funeral of an innocent person—of a mom of five kids, who cling onto her coffin, or of a young teen who lost his life to senseless gun violence. I wonder how you would feel then.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so far during debate on the Iran Joint Plan of Action, there are dozens of shortcomings and concerns when it comes to this administration's nuclear deal—the so-called P5+1. No doubt, we will hear dozens more before all is said and done.

The more we study this agreement—Republican or Democrat—the clearer it is to see that it does not measure up to its ultimate goal: to prevent a nuclear Iran.

The essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology sunset in as soon as 10 years, leaving an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program with breakout times shrinking down to nearly zero—and that is if Iran doesn't cheat—but we will have a tough time knowing because what was "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iranian nuclear sites has now become "managed access," leaving Iran as long as 24 days to scrub sites, enough time to nearly completely remove incriminating evidence of wrongdoing or the option of self-reporting compliance in places like their military base at Parchin.

However, what this deal does accomplish is to precipitate a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—a reality we are already seeing as nations like Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have already begun building up their nuclear infrastructure in response.

Any of those details should be enough to reject this deal, but that would not even mention the most objectionable portion: that this good-faith agreement with the world's largest state sponsor of terror frees up hundreds of billions of dollars in economic sanctions and frozen assets seemingly without any regard for what that money will be used for.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 months, I have had the opportunity to chair the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, which is a bipartisan group that was established by both parties of the Financial Services Committee, to look into the increasing ability for terror groups to fund and finance their actions and to evaluate the United States' response to these challenges.

Specifically, the task force examined the impact of this nuclear agreement on Tehran's state sponsorship of terror proxies across the region.

What became abundantly clear was that the influx of hundreds of billions of dollars to Iran that have been authorized in this deal will increase that nation's ability to continue regional destabilization through the support of groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraqi Shiite militias, the Houthis in Yemen, and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in Damascus.

This deal goes about rolling back sanctions while expert witnesses have testified before our task force, even as recently as yesterday, advocating for increased sanctions. There is a real disconnect here between what the experts tell us and what the administration is doing.

Iran's budget already features a nine-figure line item to support terrorism, and there is no doubt that the activities it funds will expand Iran's radical efforts—a fact even acknowledged by the administration following negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, what we have today is a bad deal, one that clears the way for a nuclear Iran, that gravely endangers allies like Israel, and, with our blessing, that makes an already volatile, unstable Middle East less safe by giving Tehran more power to fund its terror syndicates.

What is so troubling to me is that a number of my colleagues, after 2 years of negotiations that have been predicated on no deal being better than a bad deal, have begrudgingly accepted a self-admitted bad deal solely because it is better than no deal.

A better deal would include, truly, "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iran's entire nuclear program, a plan of action to oversee and manage any funds returning to Iran through sanctions relief or a return to the international banking community, the release of American prisoners improperly held by the regime, and a payment of the \$22 billion in compensation owed by Iran to families of September 11 victims, including Bucks County residents. The court judgments should be paid before Iran receives any funds under this agreement.

I urge them to reconsider what the reality of this bad deal means for the safety of the world and the future of our Nation's foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this deal because it is one that will have decades-long consequences to our national security.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING DEPUTY DARREN GOFORTH, HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Deputy Darren H. Goforth, 47 years old, who lost his life more than 10 days ago in Houston, Texas, in an execution-style killing, doing his job and serving his community.

Deputy Goforth was a Harris County Sheriff's Deputy and a man who loved his job. He loved his family, his daughter and his son, and he loved his beautiful wife. Might I share with you her words, Kathleen Goforth's:

"My husband was an incredibly intricate blend of toughness and gentility," she said in a statement following his tragic death.

He was fueling his vehicle at about 8:30 on a Friday night, and someone came behind him—the individual now in custody—and, in execution style, killed him.

"There are no words for this," his wife said. "He was always loyal—fiercely so. He was ethical. The right thing to do is what guided his internal compass."

Of course, she wanted us to know, "If people want to know what kind of man he was, this is it. He was who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor," Goforth said in a statement.

She went on to say, "However, I am who was blessed so richly that I had the privilege of calling him my husband and my best friend."

To Kathleen and her family, Deputy Goforth was the best friends of all of us. He was the best friend of the community. He was the best friend of children whom he stopped and talked to or of young people whom he sought to inspire.

He was the best friend of his friends and neighbors, as was evidenced by the 11,000 people who attended his funeral. He was the best friend of law enforcement officers. He was the best friend of the integrity of what law enforcement and first responders are all about.

He was a young man, as we came to know during the eulogy and the various statements of friends and officers, who desired to be just a helper to anyone.

We were told that, even as he worked, his father had a business and, when he had his time off, he would go to that business and help his father.

We have come to understand that it was his mode of law enforcement to, again, protect and serve but to reach out even to talk to those who weren't even looking his way. It was our understanding that he was gentle and kind and had a great sense of humor and, yes, looked like he did a little baby-sitting as well.

So I rise today to speak to this Nation about this officer and to claim the time for ending senseless violence and to recognize that his life—Deputy Goforth's life—is a testament to the goodness of the American people and our citizens in Houston and Harris County. Certainly, all of our State and local and congressional officials were there to acknowledge our deepest sense of loss.

I want to thank the people of Harris County, when we see officers, for distributing 30,000 wristbands to pray for police. I went out to the gas pump where he was so heinously and tragically shot, and all of the flowers and

notes and people raising money touched all of our hearts. Everyone stopped to pray and talk and hug.

I remember someone saying, "I am a conservative male, but I am so glad to see you here."

And I said, "My brother, I am glad to see you here. Can I hug you?" And we hugged because tragedy brings us together, but purpose should have us going forward. There should be a purpose as we lost this wonderful father and husband and law enforcement officer.

As the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, that is the very purpose that I am so excited about: this opportunity to talk about walking together, finding ways for solutions, and making sure that the life of a gentle, strong law enforcement person continues to have a presence in our lives through the way we handle our legislation and our coming together.

Foremost among these dangers, of course, are those who come upon officers in the line of duty. Just a week ago, an officer in Illinois faced an enormous tragedy and lost his life, but we realize that they understand that as they go to serve their communities.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials, the Nation—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security for all persons. It reminds us how much work we have to do and how much we are interwoven with our first responders and our law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, I was at the 9/11 commemoration, the memorial, and it reminded me of the strength of Deputy Goforth. So I would simply say we honor them.

At this time, I will ask for a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but an abiding admiration that I rise today to acknowledge the life and service of Deputy Darren Goforth of Houston, Texas.

Deputy Darren Goforth, a ten year veteran of the Harris County Sheriff's office, died on Friday, August 28, 2015, while refueling his patrol car.

He was shot fifteen times by a man who, by all accounts, never knew Darren Goforth and the light he brought into this world.

In a senseless act of violence, the love and care Darren Goforth gave to his wife, Kathleen and two young children, and the community he served, ended entirely too soon.

According to Kathleen Goforth her husband was an "intricate blend of toughness and gentility," a man who was fiercely loyal and always strived to do the right thing; a person "who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor."

May I add, Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth was what we want in an American.

Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth's life is a testament to the goodness in the American people, but his death is a reminder of many difficult and painful truths.

Foremost among these are the dangers the men and women of our nation's law enforcement departments face every time they walk their beats and patrol their communities.

Their families, the persons who know them best and love them most, deserve to welcome them home at the end of each shift, safe and sound.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront the reality that police departments and the communities they protect are all too often adversarial.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security of for all persons.

The murder of Deputy Goforth also reminds us that we must do more to stem the tide of gun violence that tears through this country.

Neither our country nor our hearts can afford to lose people of such quality as Darren Goforth to gun violence in the staggering quantities that we do.

Mr. Speaker, over 32,000 Americans die from gun violence each year.

So, while Darren Goforth's death is most certainly a tragedy, death by gun violence happens all too often in our country.

This normalcy of gun violence is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the person who ended Deputy Goforth's wonderful life, struggled with mental illness for quite some time.

We absolutely have to do more to ensure that society's most dangerous weapons stay out of the hands of the most mentally or emotionally unstable persons.

It is important that we do this because it is estimated that 61.5 million Americans experience mental illness in a given year.

This is why we must, as a nation, attach as much importance and provide the same level of resources for mental health as we do for physical health.

We can no longer afford to ignore the struggles of nearly 20 percent of the population and fail to provide adequate treatment and services that could alleviate some of that struggle and prevent horrific events like the one that claimed the life of Deputy Darren Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning the loss of Deputy Darren Goforth but I have hope.

I have hope that out of this tragedy we will be moved to act to make this country safer for the men and women who risk their lives to keep their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Darren Goforth, an extraordinary human being and a shining example of what is meant when we remember him and say: "he was one of Houston's finest."

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as this President comes closer to his final year in office, it is no secret that he only cares about shaping and molding his legacy.

When discussing the Iran deal last year, his Deputy National Security Ad-

visor said to reporters: "This is probably the biggest thing President Obama will do in his second term on foreign policy. This is health care for us."

Four years earlier, that health care—ObamaCare—was described by our Vice President as a "big—explicative—deal," but only time will shape this President's legacy.

Seventy-five years ago, Winston Churchill proclaimed that Neville Chamberlain had a "precision of mind and an aptitude for business which raised him far above the ordinary levels of our generation."

Although this description is far too generous to describe our current President, who has no aptitude for business, Mr. Chamberlain was portrayed in a very different light than he is today. If he could be characterized in one word today, it would be "appeaser."

Regardless of his intellect, Mr. Chamberlain's incorrect decision to concede to Adolf Hitler's demands for the purpose of avoiding a conflict in Europe overshadowed anything else he ever accomplished as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran deal, I believe, is President Obama's Chamberlain moment.

As the Associated Press reported 2 weeks ago, under this deal, Iran "will be allowed to use its own inspectors to investigate a site it has been accused of using to develop nuclear arms."

These reported "secret deals" acknowledge what many of us have known to be true and confirm what President Obama and his administration still deny—that this deal is based on trust.

This deal is based on trusting the Iranians in that they will not break their promise to build a nuclear bomb. How can we trust Iran's Supreme Leader, who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel"? How can we trust a Supreme Leader who said this week that Israel will not exist in 25 years?

As the former Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appropriately said, this deal would be "the equivalent of having an athlete accused of using performance enhancing drugs submit an unsupervised urine sample."

Any deal with Iran must protect America's interests at home and abroad, and this deal does not.

As Israel's Prime Minister warned in his speech before this very Chamber only a few months ago, Iran's regime poses a grave threat not only to Israel, but to the peace of the entire world.

The President and his deal supporters have ignored these warnings. This deal will shift the balance of power in the Middle East. This deal goes against the wishes of Israel, our greatest ally in the region.

I challenge all of my Democratic colleagues who support this deal to come to the floor and look into the camera—and, quite frankly, look in the mirror—so, when history comes full circle, the American people will know who in this

body let our Neville Chamberlain give Iran the bomb.

□ 1045

Despite the warnings from those within his own party and leaders of ally nations, this President has made it clear he is not concerned about the safety of Americans.

This President and his administration have made it clear they are not concerned about Israel. This President and his administration have made it well known that they are not concerned about the fate of the world. And this President and his administration are only concerned with the legacy they have in the future.

For that reason, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this President prepared to suffer the same legacy as Neville Chamberlain?

I urge President Obama and his administration to simply let their conscience be their guide.

In God we trust.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, I will look the camera in the eye and say why I am supporting this agreement. I think there is only one common thing that is agreed upon here in the House and in the Senate: that we don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons.

If the U.S. were to walk away from this deal and say we want to go back to the table, they will be sitting in an empty room, and the only people at the table will be U.S. representatives. There will not be any other nations from Europe, Russia, or China; and Iran won't be at the table either.

This is a deal that is not perfect. Sure, it is far from perfect. They say: Well, Iran could become a nuclear threshold state again in 10 or 12 years because of the way this agreement is written. If we walk away today, they are a nuclear threshold state; and they will build a bomb, and they will have it within 3 or 4 months. Then what?

Well, we do have options, of course. They are being recommended by Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu, all who were cheerleaders for the Iraq war and who were oh so wrong about the greatest foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America. But they learned nothing from that, and they think yet another war in the Mideast is a better solution than this.

Now what does Iran give up? Two-thirds of its centrifuges. They are allowed to keep the oldest, most primitive centrifuges. Ninety-seven percent of its enriched uranium stockpile will be gone. Their mine sites will be monitored 24/7. Their mill sites for uranium will be monitored 24/7. There will be an intrusive inspection regime. They have to fill in the core of the nearly finished Iraq reactor—which can take them on

the plutonium path to a bomb—with concrete and convert that to peaceful use.

Natanz, underneath the mountain that some would have us bomb—unfortunately, it is underneath the mountain—that will become a medical facility monitored 24/7. No. That is Fordow, excuse me, not Natanz. Yet we hear the drumbeat for war over here. They don't want to say they want to have a war, but that is the ultimate conclusion.

If you don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons, this is the best deal we can get, and we amazingly got this deal with the support of Russia, China, and four nations in Europe.

Now, they are already flooding into Iran in anticipation of this deal going forward. They have no intention of going back to the table. The Chinese want the oil. Russians want to sell them weapons. The planes have been totally full coming out of Europe with high-level corporate executives wanting to go into Iran and do business.

No. This is the only alternative before the United States Congress and the only one that can prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon in the short term. Yes, 12, 15 years down the road, we may have to deal with this again. Yet again, 12 or 15 years from now, under this regime, perhaps Iran will have changed. We will see.

So I am proud of this vote, and I think it is the best path. I am also incredibly proud of my vote against popular opinion and such sagacious people as Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu about invading Iraq, which has turned the Middle East into an unbelievable mess that will not be undone in my lifetime. ISIS is basically a product of the Iraq war, an invasion by the U.S.

So let's not create even worse problems. Let's take this imperfect agreement, but let's take it because it prevents Iran from having a nuclear weapon and having a weapons race in this incredibly unstable part of the world.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third District of Kansas and on behalf of American people who are counting on us to put their security before the obvious partisan politics of Washington, D.C. I also join a bipartisan majority, leaders of each party in each Chamber, to stand up and be counted as one of the many voices in this country in opposition to the President's deal with Iran.

Like others who plan to oppose the ratification of this deal, I am not opposed to the idea of diplomacy, but I am opposed to the idea of surrender diplomacy. This administration asked us to trust Iran; but as Iran continues to be the largest world state sponsor of terror, as they continue to shout

“death to America” and call for our destruction and the obliteration of Israel, our greatest ally, how can we trust Iran?

With secret deals, side deals, and self-verification, this President's capitulation will lead to a nuclear Iran for the first time in history and an American endorsement of their efforts to get there.

Well, the Ayatollah has convinced the President that it only needs nuclear capacity for peaceful purposes. But why does Iran need nuclear capacity at all? Iran has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, totalling 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, totalling 1.193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

With such a robust energy sector, why should Iran, a nation that has consistently defied the international community on this issue, be granted the ability to proceed with a nuclear energy program? Why should we trust Iran? Have they earned the right to be trusted?

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this is a gift to the ayatollahs of Iran. For starters, it releases hundreds of billions of dollars in assets to the regime in Iran, giving them a gift basket full of cash to flood terrorist organizations which seek to harm Americans and our allies.

The deal gives the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a stamp of legitimacy and the means to expand its destabilizing influence through massive amounts of sanctions relief, even before Iran has demonstrated full adherence to the deal's term. It does, however, bring home the four Americans being imprisoned in Iran.

When questioned as to why, this administration claims that it did not demand the release of American prisoners because it wanted to limit negotiations to just Iran's nuclear program.

On the contrary, Iran won key non-nuclear concessions through the process. The deal grants amnesty to Qasem Soleimani, the head of the Quds force in Iran's Revolutionary Guard, who is one of the world's most leading terrorist masterminds and the man thought responsible for the death of at least 500 United States troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It also lifts the conventional arms embargo on Iran in spite of public testimony from Secretary of Defense Ash Carter and Joint Chiefs Chairman Martin Dempsey that we should do so “under no circumstances.”

Lifting this embargo means Iran can begin to stockpile conventional weapons, and Russia and China can begin to legally profit off major weapons exports to Tehran.

Yet perhaps the most troubling aspect of this deal is its inspections regime. Gone are the anytime, anywhere inspections that were required by Congress and outlined by the administration. In its place, a 24-day notice period for Iran, combined with secret side

deals that this Congress has no knowledge of and in which the proponents of the plan are happy to be blissfully ignorant.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this deal know that it does not make us safer or more secure. They know that we cannot trust Iran. They know that the verification process is weak and is built upon secret deals, they know we shouldn't lift the arms embargo, and they know that the hundreds of billions of dollars being released to the Ayatollah will end up on the battlefield in the hands of terrorists who will use it to kill Americans and our allies. Mr. Speaker, they know this is a bad deal.

I'm proud to have my name listed along with Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan majority opposing this deal.

Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. In 1994, we heard President Clinton sell his nuclear agreement with North Korea on many of the same talking points President Obama used in his speech to sell this deal with Iran. Yet in 2006, we watched as the North Koreans detonated a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to stop this, and I urge—I beg—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this deal so we aren't watching Iranians detonate their own bomb just a few years from now.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 250

In the Senate of the United States, September 9, 2015.

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the decision by the House leadership to back off from a direct vote on a resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear accord as provided under the Corker Act.

Clearly, the President has not complied with the requirements of Corker to provide Congress with the full text of its agreement with Iran, most specifically, the side deals referenced in the agreement between Iran and the IAEA.

H. Res. 411, which declares the administration out of compliance with the Corker Act, is well-founded, but there is no reason to cancel the vote on the resolution disapproving the agreement as specified in the Corker Act and as promised by the House leadership for the last 6 weeks.

H. Res. 411 rightly disputes September 17 as the deadline for congressional action to stop this treaty from taking effect, and I support that resolution, but it cannot authoritatively settle this dispute. That leaves the deadline as an open question, and this House must not let that deadline pass without definite action as provided by Corker.

I oppose the act because it guts the Treaty Clause of the Constitution that requires treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate. Despite the President's contention that this is an agreement and not a treaty, the fact that it explicitly modifies the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty makes it obvious that it requires Senate ratification.

Unfortunately, the Congress overwhelmingly approved the Corker Act, establishing a very different framework with respect to this particular treaty. Instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify it, Corker, in es-

sence, requires two-thirds of both Houses to reject it through a resolution of disapproval, an almost impossible threshold.

Under Corker, the resolution of disapproval is the specific legal act required to reject this treaty. This is what the leadership had promised the House would vote on this week, until yesterday. Now we are to vote on a legally meaningless bill to approve the treaty that is expected to be voted down. It is specifically designed to have no legal effect but merely to give Members political cover.

Thus, the House will fail to take action on a resolution of disapproval called for under the Corker Act by the disputed September 17 deadline. On that deadline, the President will declare victory, implement the treaty, and the Congress will be left sputtering. The world will correctly interpret this dereliction as a capitulation by the House to this treaty. And years from now, maybe, possibly, the courts will intervene to declare the President's action illegal or maybe not.

Mr. Speaker, the House is right to dispute the September 17 deadline because clearly the President did not comply with provisions of Corker and provide the full text of the side agreements to the Congress; but the House is dead wrong to refuse to take action on the resolution of disapproval prior to the disputed deadline to assure that the House has spoken clearly, unambiguously, and indisputably according to the provisions of the Corker Act that the Congress, itself, enacted in May. Once it has acted, the House can still dispute whether the President's submission meets the requirements of Corker, but it will not have this momentous question dangling unresolved and in dispute.

The argument we hear for this course is that the Senate is unlikely to take up a resolution of disapproval; therefore, we should hold the President to the letter of Corker. Well, what the Senate does is up to the Senate; but for our part, the House has a moral obligation to act within the undisputed timeframe to legally reject this dangerous action by the President.

There is little doubt that this treaty will trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. The leaders of Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia have already made that abundantly clear. There is little doubt it is unverifiable.

There is no doubt it will release \$150 billion of frozen assets to Iran with which it can finance its terrorist operations and continue its nuclear research.

□ 1100

I fear the Iran nuclear agreement may be just as significant to the fate of the 21st century as the Munich Agreement was to the 20th century. The American people and the world deserve a clear, unambiguous, and indisputable act of the House to repudiate this act. What the House leadership is now pur-

suing falls far short of this moral imperative.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, last month, I traveled to Israel with more than 35 of my colleagues to meet with key leaders in that country, including Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand what our closest ally in the Middle East thinks about the proposed Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

The consensus view from the Israelis across the political spectrum, from the Prime Minister to the opposition leader in the Knesset, Isaac Herzog, from the President of the State of Israel, Reuven Rivlin, to the military leaders in the Israeli Defense Forces, they all agree that the deal negotiated by Secretary Kerry and championed by President Obama is a dangerous and historic mistake.

This confirms what we have learned in briefings and hearings in Congress. This deal will not deliver the safety and security the American people deserve. Instead, it will transform Iran from the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism with an illicit nuclear program into the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism awash in billions of dollars in sanctions relief with an internationally sanctioned nuclear program on an industrial scale.

This is not just a bad deal for Israel. This is not just a bad deal for America. A nuclear Iran is a global threat to everyone everywhere. Consider the counterparty to this deal. Since the seizure of the U.S. Embassy and the taking of 52 American hostages during the 1979 revolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken the long view on its global ambitions of exporting its revolution, supporting terrorist proxies like Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, and Boko Haram.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the leader of its elite Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, is responsible for the killing of over 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

The Iranian regime has covered up and lied about its nuclear program for decades, deceiving international inspectors, agreeing to intrusive inspections, and then allowing those inspections to be implemented only provisionally and selectively. Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, regularly chants "death to America" and openly calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people and the destruction of Israel.

In Jerusalem, we visited the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial museum. There, we saw exhibits recounting the horrifying images of the Holocaust. During our visit with Prime Minister

Netanyahu, he made a profound observation. He said they compare this to the 1930s.

This is not like the 1930s. In the 1930s, the Nazis concealed their intentions for the Jewish people in the Holocaust. Here, they are actually telling us. They are telling us what they want to do to the Jewish people and death to the Great Satan. Let's not give them the tools to actually carry it out.

The President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections has been replaced with managed access to suspect nuclear sites in which international inspectors must appeal to Iran, Russia, and China. This bureaucratic process could take up to 24 days at least, during which Iran would remove anything covert or in violation of the agreement.

The Associated Press now reports that at least one of two secret deals between the IAEA and Iran—secret deals neither Congress nor even the Secretary of State has been allowed to see—allows Iran to use its own inspectors at the military complex long suspected as the headquarters of Iran's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile program.

Given the Iranian regime's past behavior and contempt for U.S. negotiators it knows are weak, there is little doubt Iran will cheat and dare the Obama administration to find violations which prove the very deficiencies of the deal it negotiated.

Even if Iran does not cheat, even if Iran actually complies with the deal, three bad outcomes are guaranteed. First, Iran will be allowed an arsenal—not a bomb—an arsenal of nuclear weapons in as little as 10 years.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology, is permitted to retain vast enrichment capacity, may continue research and development on advanced centrifuges, and will be allowed to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles in as little as 8 years. Intercontinental ballistic missiles—those are not for Tel Aviv; those are for Washington, D.C., and New York.

Second, Iran gets sanctions relief, at least \$56 billion almost immediately, and that is according to the Obama administration itself. Independent analysis projects the relief could be as much as \$150 billion. As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorist Financing, I have heard extensive testimony that, when these funds are released, a significant percentage will go to Iran's terrorist proxies in Gaza, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, and elsewhere. Experts warn it will be impossible to snap back effective sanctions.

Third, because Iran's neighbors know this deal reverses a decades-long bipartisan U.S. policy blocking Iran's nuclear program, this agreement will spark a nuclear arms race in the broader Middle East. Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt have already signaled their intent to acquire nuclear retaliatory capability if this deal is finalized. The people who know Iran the best trust them the least.

This President says it is this deal or war, but that is a false choice. Rejecting this deal will keep most sanctions in place and allow Congress and our allies to turn up the pressure on Iran to get a better deal. In fact, I signed a letter with 366 colleagues outlining the conditions we would consider to be part of a better deal, none of which were included in the one before us.

On the last night we were in Israel, one of the last nights, as we finished dinner at a restaurant on the Sea of Galilee, the owner of the restaurant took the microphone and announced that Members of the American Congress were here to stop this bad Iran deal. The whole restaurant stood up and sang "God Bless America."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the Iran deal, I proudly stand with our allies in Israel, not with the mullahs in Tehran.

WHY THE IRAN AGREEMENT MUST BE OPPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to just associate myself with the comments of my good friend from Kentucky, who was just up here and I think eloquently was giving a case as to why this deal with Iran is such a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the national security consequences of the nuclear agreement with Iran will haunt America for generations if Congress does not step in to stop it. This shouldn't be about party. It should not be about loyalty to the President because, if one thinks about this current President, whether you like him or don't like him, whether you agree with him or don't agree with him, this administration ends in 15 months, but the national security consequences of this deal will go on and haunt America for generations to come.

This deal, this agreement, needs to be evaluated on the substance and how it will impact America and will it make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Americans and a bipartisan majority of this Congress are against this agreement. It makes America less safe. If it survives, it is only because the President was able to ram it through on a wholly partisan basis. That is not something to celebrate, Mr. Speaker. The fact that there is zero bipartisan support for this pact in the United States Congress further demonstrates just how dangerous this is for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my very first speech on the floor of this House in 2011, I stated my belief that Iran was the greatest national security threat that we had. Today, I am even more committed that Iran is the greatest threat that we have to our own national security.

By proving that aggression and defiance will be rewarded, this agreement

makes the world less safe and, tragically, war more likely. What are we saying to our neighbors? If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, surely its neighbors will go on a nuclear arms race as well and will make this dangerous part of the world even less safe than it already is, far more volatile.

These concerns have been bipartisan. According to Democratic Senator BOB MENENDEZ, this agreement doesn't end Iran's nuclear program, it preserves it. According to Democratic Senator CHUCK SCHUMER: "If Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement, it must simply exercise patience."

Simply put, this agreement won't block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. Instead, it leaves Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact and amounts to a containment strategy. Settling for only containing a nuclear Iran is a grave mistake that leaves the long-term safety of the United States and our allies vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Iran.

We are all familiar with the basic reasons for why this reckless agreement should be opposed. The agreement relies on a sure-to-fail inspections regime that falls well short of anytime, anywhere inspections that are so critically needed. It fails to deliver on the commitment to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Iran actually receives a signing bonus that trades permanent sanctions relief for temporary limitations on its nuclear program. This will provide Iran, the world's greatest state sponsor of terror—and that is not up for debate; that is not disputed—with \$150 billion, which they will no doubt use to fund terror through their proxies in Hezbollah and Hamas, through Assad in Syria, and through cells in South and Central America—sunset provisions, which simply gives Iran a patient path to a nuclear weapon.

This agreement lifts conventional arms embargo in 5 years and ballistic missile embargo in 8 years. Why were these even on the table, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I ask you: What do you use an intercontinental ballistic missile for? It is not to drop leaflets; it is not for humanitarian needs. It is to deliver a nuclear warhead to Washington, to New York, to Chicago.

I am perplexed because, Mr. Speaker, like many here in this body, I have three children, and they have children. We have constituents that are out there. I have a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old, and an 8-year-old. By the time my 8-year-old goes to college, she will not know a world without Iran having a nuclear weapon. The chants of "death to America" in the streets, at some point in time, we have to take their word that that is exactly what they want to do.

When we look at this agreement, this legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and provides Iran's illicit nuclear pursuit with international stamps of approval. This is what Iran has been desperately

seeking; yet we have just handed it to them on a platter.

Let's remember, when the negotiations began, Iran was an isolated nation. Their economy was in ruins; they were under heavy sanctions and were outside the international community, but this process has ended with the administration isolating and hammering Israel and the administration coercing Congress to accept a deal by asserting that the United States would otherwise be blamed for it falling apart.

On August 5, the President gave a speech to promote the Iran agreement, and he delivered the following line, which had its intended effect of isolating Israel and minimizing her concerns. Because this is such a strong deal, he said, every other nation in the world has commented publicly, with the exception of the Israeli Government, that they have expressed their support.

I understand my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to just note again that a nuclear-armed Iran is the greatest threat we have to our own national security going forward, and giving the international stamp of approval to them will make the world a less safe place and jeopardize the United States of America, our citizens, and our allies abroad.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As vacations and recesses draw to a close, we give thanks for the gift of rest and recreation afforded us while so many in our country and world have spent those same days in fear and suffering.

May we leave business as usual in the shadows of yesterday, seeking to shine with renewed purpose, inspired wisdom, and transformative action.

May every person associated with these Halls of power remember their calling as public servants to humbly hold the hopes, dreams, and trust of people from every walk of life in every State, city, town, village, and neighborhood of our country and world.

As numerous streams of opinion, interest, and need flow into the procedures, process, and decisions of this

day and days ahead, may there be wisdom and patience to allow them to find their way to pools and ponds of peace, rivers of mercy, and eventually oceans of compassion and common good for all people.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN DEAL: NOT VERIFIABLE, ENFORCEABLE, OR ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear fact that these are dangerous times and that the regime in Iran is a dangerous threat to world peace. The President's legacy of failed policies of weakness has led to the Middle East in chaos, with refugee families fleeing for their lives and many drowning at sea.

It is not too late to stop a bad situation from getting even worse. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to every country everywhere. We need a deal that is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

Is it verifiable? No. Because of secret deals, it will be the Iranians who get to certify whether or not they are complying.

Is it enforceable? No, because the sanctions that have been effective in forcing them to the bargaining table will be lifted. Iran will then have the money it needs to complete its nuclear programs, missile development, and expand their funding of terror. With future terrorist attacks, media should trace the funding to determine if the source is from this deal.

Is it accountable? No, because the deal permits Iran to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges to enrich uranium.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions

never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

KEO 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Kauai Economic Opportunity, a non-profit multiagency known as KEO.

For half a century, this agency has been providing services to thousands of Kauai residents in need, to ease the pain of poverty, and to help them achieve self-sufficiency. As the only human services organization on that island, they have been a lifeline for low-income families and individuals who are looking for a second chance. In the past year alone, KEO has assisted over 5,000 individuals with housing, education, food, medical services, legal services, child care, transportation, disaster preparedness, employment opportunities, and so much more.

I would like to say mahalo nui loa to CEO MaBel Ferreiro-Fujiuchi, Chair Brenda Viado, the board members, staff, volunteers, and everyone else who selflessly dedicated their time, attention, and aloha to ensure the people of Kauai always have a friend to help them in their time of need.

STOP THE BARRIERS OF OUR FOREST SERVICE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, well, once again, with the end of a summer vacation that still has, in California and the West, the onset of fire season, California has seen twice the number of acres of trees burned so far this year, and fire season is far from over.

While we are working to pass reforms to return responsible management to our national forests, the work doesn't stop when the fires are put out.

Every single day that a tree lies dead on the floor of the forest means it loses more and more of its salvage value and then becomes a cost of the taxpayers to remove later, and it is also more dangerous fuel for the next fire.

It is imperative that the Forest Service act rapidly to salvage these downed trees and conduct replanting and forest recovery or we will simply end up with more fuel on the ground the next time an area burns.

While the Forest Service estimates there are 12 million dead trees already in the Sierra Nevada, virtually no work is being done to remove these dead trees from these forests. We must stop the barriers to getting the work done that is needed for our forests to be healthy and safe.

JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to ask a simple question of those who oppose the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Can you show me a viable alternative to this agreement that will lead to tougher international sanctions on Iran and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon?

Scholars and diplomats, including President Bush's Iran negotiator, Ambassador Nicholas Burns, have stated before Members of this very body that there is no way we will be able to keep Russia, China, and India in the sanctions regime if we reject this agreement. We tried secondary sanctions in 1996, and they failed. Our European allies have made it clear that, should the United States reject this agreement, we are on our own.

Despite these facts, it baffles me that some of my colleagues have concluded that, by rejecting this agreement, we can somehow get a better deal with less leverage.

No deal is perfect, especially one negotiated among adversaries, but the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the best option we have on the table today. This agreement puts the United States in a better position to confront the Iranian regime's threat to world peace.

OPPOSITION TO THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the President's proposed agreement with Iran.

Iran is the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism. They support the murderous Assad regime in Syria, they support Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon, and they support the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Iran-backed militias have killed American troops in Iraq.

Negotiation is founded upon trust, and there can be no trust for the mullahs who run Iran. To quote Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel: "Regimes rooted in brutality must never be trusted. And the words and actions of the leadership of Iran leave no doubt as to their intentions."

In March, I joined with 366 of my fellow Members of Congress, including 130 Democrats, in a letter to President Obama. We agreed that any deal with Iran must last for multiple decades and include full disclosure of Iran's past nuclear pursuits with anytime, anywhere inspections for verification. This agreement does not meet these standards.

For these and many other reasons, we must not support it.

POPE FRANCIS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, Pope Francis will address this body in a joint session this month, and I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say I am eager to receive the Holy Father's message of peace as a reminder of where our priorities should be in our work here in the House.

As the Pope explained earlier this year in an encyclical, becoming a better steward of our environment should be a priority for all of us.

The leader of the Catholic Church accurately points out that it is a moral imperative to care for others and the gifts we have been given by addressing climate change, and addressing it now. It is time to work together to better protect our environment and build a culture of stewardship.

I thank Pope Francis for his focus on this issue, and I hope the words he will share in 2 weeks ring true with all of us, including those who continue to deny climate change, both in this body and around the world. For having the wisdom to change one's mind and evolve in thought is a blessing.

I hope the Pope's encyclical will encourage deniers to work with us to find creative ways to clean up our environment, help create jobs, and make our world just a little bit better and more peaceful for our kids and our grandkids.

RECOGNIZING DR. VICKI RUIZ

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Dr. Vicki Ruiz, a distinguished professor of history and Chicano/Latino studies at the University of California, Irvine.

Dr. Ruiz is also the president of the American Historical Association, and was most recently named a recipient of the 2014 National Humanities Medal. The National Humanities Medal is awarded to those who have deepened the country's understanding of humanities and broadened citizens' engagement with history, literature, languages, and philosophy.

This afternoon, Dr. Ruiz will be one of only 10 honorees from top universities to receive this prestigious award from President Obama. In fact, Dr. Ruiz is the first faculty member of UCI to receive the National Humanities Medal.

As the first in her family to earn an advanced degree, Dr. Ruiz began her work at UCI in 2001. In 2008, she was named Dean of Humanities, and currently chairs the Department of Chi-

cano/Latino Studies in the School of Social Sciences.

Please join me in recognizing Dr. Ruiz as she receives this prestigious award today at the White House.

RESTORE HONOR TO SERVICE MEMBERS ACT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell 4 years ago, we noted that gay and lesbian Americans have fought with distinction in every war in our Nation's history, which is true. But while they fought to protect us, we failed to protect them.

Over 100,000 Americans were discharged from the military between 1945 and 2011 solely because of their sexual orientation. These discharges were often less than honorable, which impacted their veterans benefits and served as a rebuke to their service and sacrifice.

We can and must do better.

The Department of Defense allows veterans who were discharged solely for their sexual orientation to petition for an upgrade to an honorable discharge. I encourage all of my colleagues to conduct research in their districts to inform veterans of this opportunity and to assist them in their applications.

Congress should pass the Restore Honor to Service Members Act, introduced by Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and Congressman MARK POCAN, to codify this opportunity for veterans to remove this insult from their records.

A good and grateful Nation owes these brave Americans nothing less.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Iranian agreement's completion, its proponents have insisted that the deal is based on verification, not on trust. That is because Iran is not a country that can be trusted, evidenced by their funding of terror, detention of American citizens, and past attempts of secretive nuclear armament.

However, as details are continuing to be revealed, it is clear that negotiations were, in fact, based on trust. The verification this agreement hinges upon has been entrusted to the Iranians themselves, while objective inspections of their facilities can be delayed for weeks and weeks at a time. To top it all off, Congress still doesn't have access to the agreement in its entirety.

It is entirely naive for supporters of this agreement to trust an unstable, hostile theocracy to self-certify on nuclear weapons when the Federal Government doesn't even trust our own American citizens, farmers and ranchers, to self-certify on farm fuel storage.

I strongly encourage all attempts to disarm Iran, but the Ayatollah's aggressive actions and statements against the U.S. and our allies, particularly Israel, have shattered their credibility in the international community. And the President's threat to veto alterations to his deal confirms his personal commitment to his own legacy rather than the concerns of the American people and our closest allies.

Congress cannot accept the terms of this agreement which empower an untrustworthy and hostile nation in an already dangerously unstable region.

□ 1215

DIEZ Y SEIS PARADE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th celebration of the Diez y Seis parade in my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas.

In 1965, Juanita Salinas and Pauline Valenciano both recognized that Fort Worth did not have a public celebration for Mexico's Independence Day. Together, the organization that they worked with began organizing the parade as a way to celebrate this important event for the Latin American community.

For the last five decades, their work has grown—and the celebration has, too—into one of the largest in the country for Hispanic heritage events. The hard work by the committee will be seen during this year's parade on September 12, which also will serve as the kickoff for National Hispanic Heritage Month.

I want to personally thank Juanita and her committee for their continued commitment to the Hispanic community in Fort Worth. I wish them their best on this 50th year.

RULE FOR IRAN DEAL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian nuclear deal unacceptably lifts certain sanctions on individuals like:

Qasem Soleimani—in the middle—the current commander of Iran's Quds Force, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American servicemen and -women in Iraq and that is right now leading Iran's efforts against the U.S.' interests in the Middle East;

Ahmad Vahidi, the former Quds Force commander and defense minister, who is still wanted by Interpol for his role in the 1994 AMIA Jewish community center bombing in Buenos Aires, which claimed the lives of 85 people;

The former head of Iran's atomic energy agency who was sanctioned by the U.N. for his nuclear and ballistic missile activities;

Gerhard Wisser—right here—the German engineer who facilitated the sale of nuclear equipment to North Korea, Iran, and Libya;

Also, the former head of Iran's nuclear weapons program, who has been described as Iran's Dr. AQ Khan.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a brief sample of the many people who will have additional resources, access, and freedom to continue their terror and nuclear weapons activity as part of this unacceptable program. We can and must get a better nuclear deal.

REPUBLICAN DYSFUNCTION

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am disgusted and ashamed.

Instead of working to address our most pressing issues like jobs, the economy, long-term highway transportation funding, and a responsible budget, my Republican colleagues are meeting behind closed doors, scheming up plans that delay our work here—putting our economy and our constituents' jobs at risk. It is past time that Republicans put the needs of the Americans before partisan politics.

American businesses that have what it takes to compete globally are being left behind because of the Republicans' refusal to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

The uncertainty placed on State and local governments by the Republicans' refusal to put forth a long-term highway funding bill is unconscionable. Let's not forget that we have yet to produce and pass a responsible budget. We cannot have a repeat of 2013 with our people out of work.

I urge my colleagues to put partisan politics aside, and let's do what we have been called here to do. Based on the latest antics, I can't tell if I am a freshman in high school or a freshman in Congress.

IRAN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject President Obama's Iranian nuclear deal, which would lift sanctions on the regime before delivering any proof that it is acting in good faith to curb its nuclear program.

I continue to have concerns that this deal is dangerous and will simply delay Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We should seek a strong deal to ensure that the current regime is never able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

This is not what we have been delivered by the negotiators. Sanctions against the regime are the reason they came to the negotiating table. We

should negotiate from a position of strength and not surrender to removing sanctions before there is proof of compliance.

The President is attempting to sell the American public on a deal that provides billions of dollars that can be used to support Iran's clandestine activities, which will further destabilize the region. Any agreement must first advance our national security and the security of our allies.

A clear indicator of future performance is always past performance. Unfortunately, Iran has a decades-long history of misrepresentation when it comes to its nuclear program.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we mark the 14th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks on America.

This day will forever remain as one of the most somber in American history; but out of all of the horrific and heartbreaking stories, there are also stories of heroism and honor.

In the minutes, hours, and days after the attacks, thousands of firefighters, paramedics, police, and other first responders ran into the Twin Towers, toward the Pentagon, and to the Pennsylvania crash site. They risked their lives for all of us.

Now we need to make sure we are still there to support them, which is why I am proud to cosponsor the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act.

This legislation provides medical treatment and financial compensation to the first responders who were harmed in the 9/11 attacks. We owe them this with their medical bills and so much more. Our Nation will forever be grateful for their sacrifice.

A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA AND THE WORLD

(Mr. MOOLENAAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, successful diplomacy requires statesmanship, a mutual benefit, and a commitment to peace. None of these elements are a part of the administration's deal with Iran.

On statesmanship, this administration's acquiescence has been met with Iranian hostility. Just this week, the Ayatollah said Israel would be destroyed within 25 years. Words matter, and we cannot discount Iran's dangerous rhetoric.

Where is the mutual benefit?

Short of immediate access to a nuclear bomb, Iran has been given all it wants. It will receive billions of dollars it can use to fund terrorism against

our country and our allies. It will be allowed to reject “anytime, anywhere” inspections that are vital to verifying compliance and ensuring our national security. In less than 15 years, Iran will be allowed to have a nuclear weapons program that is capable of attacking targets anywhere in the world.

The fundamental question is: Are we willing to gamble that Iran’s Government will end its destructive behavior and belligerent rhetoric in the coming days?

I, for one, am not willing to take that chance. I believe this is a bad deal for America and the world, and I oppose it.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian deal—I stand in the absolute, strongest possible opposition.

What would make America think that Iran’s having a nuclear capability in 13 years would be a good idea?

What would make any American believe that, in 5 years, relaxing the sanctions on conventional arms—the same 10,000 missiles that struck Israel—and, in 8 years, relaxing the sanctions on ICBMs would be a good idea? There is only one purpose for an ICBM, and that is to attack every city in the United States.

Lastly, because this deal does not dismantle anything, in 13 years, Iran could legally have a path for at least 100 ICBMs.

Those are the facts in voting for this bill when there are secret deals that no Congressman has seen. No Congressman has looked at the deal.

My job is truth. My job is to deliver truth to the American people, to deliver truth to Montana, and this deal is not truthful. We are rewarding Iran with \$50 billion to \$100 billion.

Terrorism—the idea that we take this deal or go to war is patently false. Sanctions work. We need a dismantle for this mantle. I ask my colleagues to be Americans first and vote against this bill.

CORRECTION OF COSPONSOR

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 2015, one of my staff members mistakenly added Congresswoman MCSALLY from Arizona to H.R. 3443, as a cosponsor, instead of to H.R. 3339.

Both my staff and I acknowledge and take full responsibility for this unintended addition of Ms. MCSALLY’s name, and I apologize for any confusion and inconvenience that this error has caused. This cosponsorship was not authorized by Representative MCSALLY.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3443

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) from H.R. 3443.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, when I got on the plane to return from Texas yesterday, I felt like it was a done deal—the Iran deal was going to happen.

But guess what. Conservatives in the House came together with a better idea, fueled by hundreds of folks out on the lawn when Senator TED CRUZ was speaking.

We have come up with a solution that will at least possibly stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It is the bill we have got coming up, which points out that the President has not met his requirement.

The entire deal, together with the side agreements, puts the President and the banks and businesses that are doing business with Iran—and who might start to do that—on notice that they are potentially civilly and criminally liable. We are going to use the judicial branch of the government to help keep America safe.

As I read on one of the signs on the lawn yesterday: What part of “death to America” do you not understand?

The Iran deal is a bad deal, and it needs to be stopped, and we are fighting here in the House of Representatives to do that.

PHILIPPI HEROES

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend three local citizens from Philippi, West Virginia.

The first is Twila Smith, a teacher at Philip Barbour High School. On August 25, one of her students brought a gun to school and held her classmates hostage. Twila did a miraculous job in calming the teenager and buying time until the police could arrive.

Philippi Police Chief Jeff Walters and the young man’s pastor, Howard Swick, are our next two heroes. They negotiated the release of the student hostages and then convinced the teenager to surrender voluntarily.

Because of these heroes and their courage in a threatening situation, more than 700 high school students were unharmed, and this man will now

be able to receive the help that he needs.

OPPOSE THE IRAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEAL

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this agreement with Iran will bring the world closer to war.

Under this deal, Iran can make its centrifuges used to make nuclear weapons;

Iran is trusted to inspect itself;

The U.S. must come to the aid of Iran if there is sabotage against its weapons program, and in the meantime, Iran is buying anti-aircraft weapons and fighter jets from Russia to strengthen their military;

Iran will have the sanctions lifted with no proof required that they are in compliance;

The President himself admits this deal neither denies nor deters Iran from a nuclear bomb—only delays. Meanwhile, Iran continues to chant “death to America” and “death to Israel,” and it continues to imprison four Americans—the same Iran that supplies weapons and help to terrorists throughout the world.

The Iran nuclear deal makes the Middle East and the world far more perilous and war inevitable. It is naive and dangerous to believe otherwise. The American people rightly oppose this deal, and I oppose this deal. For the sake of peace, Congress must oppose this deal.

□ 1230

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most important national security matters this Chamber will vote on, and that is the President’s dangerous nuclear deal with Iran.

We have heard a lot about this this morning. I heard a lot about it while I was in the district during the August work period. I traveled across Georgia’s 12th District and spoke with my constituents about this terrible agreement.

Today I come to the floor again to voice the concerns I heard from the overwhelming majority and to say to my colleagues in the House and Senate we must stop this deal.

The consequences of the President’s agreement are clear. We have heard it over and over. It will chart a clear path to allow Iran nuclear capability. In the meantime, the Iranian regime will use billions of dollars in sanctions relief to continue promoting terrorism.

I visited Israel last month and met with the nation’s leaders, including

Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand about the security threats Israel and the region face every day. We cannot allow this deal to move forward and further empower those who seek the destruction of Israel, the same leaders who shout “death to America.”

I reject the President’s false choice between this bad deal or war.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of September 11, 2001, when Islamist terrorists attacked our country, killing nearly 3,000 innocent people.

While that day brought terrible destruction, it also sparked a renewed sense of determination and unity that should not be forgotten.

Today, we must recognize that the threat from Islamist extremism is as great as ever. We are in a generational fight against terrorists like ISIS who seek our complete destruction and that of our allies and our way of life. We must remain vigilant and have the courage and will to stand against this evil to protect Americans and ensure our enemies never have a chance to attack us again.

This week, we remember Americans who lost their lives 14 years ago—Americans like Aaron Jeremy Jacobs and Karol Ann Keasler, both born in Tucson, Arizona, and killed in New York City—and we remember the bravery and selfless acts of the first responders and ordinary citizens who put themselves in danger so that others may live.

Our thoughts and our prayers continue to be with the family and friends of those who died.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 9, 2015 at 9:42 a.m.:

Appointments:
Congressional Award Board.
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People’s Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 411, FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3461, APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3460, SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate, with 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee, 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee, and one hour controlled by the Minority Leader or her designee; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman and my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I want to say to the Speaker pro tempore, “Happy birthday.” We were celebrating your birthday at the Texas lunch. We are sorry you were unable to attend.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this rule would empower the U.S. House of Representatives with the opportunity to block this administration’s devastating nuclear deal with the country of Iran. It is my belief that this deal needs to be ripped up word by word, line by line, and it is this body that needs to help do that. The process is going on today and tomorrow, and it needs to continue until we kill this deal.

This rule includes three legislative items and is designed to give the U.S. House of Representatives multiple opportunities to block this disastrous Iran deal.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear from the beginning: There is nothing unprecedented about this rule. What is unprecedented is that the administration, an administration of the United States, has negotiated a deal that pardons a state that supports terrorism and turns it into a legitimate nuclear state in a matter of time.

There is nothing to hide in this rule; whereas, a significant part of this so-called deal with Iran is still hidden, not just by side agreements, but in facts of the case that it was up to the United States Congress to openly understand, to debate, and then to make decisions on.

First, H. Res. 411 would find that the President has not complied with the requirements of section 2 of the Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which passed Congress and became law of the United States of America in May of 2015. This resolution simply says that the President should follow the law—the law he signed only 4 months ago—and give Congress access to all parts of the deal as they pertain to this nuclear opportunity and deal that is being cut, including the IAEA and Iran.

Second, H.R. 3460 would stop the administration from lifting sanctions placed currently on Iran.

Third, H.R. 3461 would allow for a vote to approve the deal that the administration made with Iran regarding its nuclear program. While previous legislation would have allowed Congress to disapprove this deal, this legislation would not allow the deal to go

forward without congressional approval.

So, Mr. Speaker, what does the administration deal do? Well, first, the deal guarantees permanent sanctions relief, but only temporarily blocks Iran from building a nuclear bomb. In other words, this deal would inject—I assume really as a signing bonus—\$150 billion into the Iranian economy with almost completely no rules or regulations related to the use of the money, and it would allow Iran to build and possess a nuclear bomb in just a matter of a few, short, 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, we should not encourage the leading funder of terrorism in the world to have immediate access to billions of dollars now and billions of dollars later. Let there be no doubt, this money will go to Hezbollah, Hamas and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, groups that are dedicated to wiping out not only the United States but our friends and allies around the world, including their number one target, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited the Middle East in May of this year, we met with our partners all around the region, and they were furious that this administration was negotiating with Iran. Presidents from both parties have spent decades in the United States persuading countries around the region not to build a nuclear bomb, yet now this administration wants to allow Iran to have access to that, that which we have been protecting and holding away from even our closest friends. We will give that to this country that calls us the “evil empire.”

Under this administration, for 6 years, America has led from behind. We have led from behind when it should have been chosen to lead from the front. Now this administration has decided to engage with a nation that jails Americans and where “death to America” and “death to Israel” is chanted every single day all over the streets of Iran and by its chosen leaders. Even worse, when the administration chose to engage with Iran, it chose to negotiate from a position of weakness. This negotiation ended with a deal that gives Iran literally everything it wants and, as I see it, delivers nothing for the American people.

So what does this deal exactly do? Instead of allowing international inspectors into sites within 24 hours, the administration agreed to give Iran 24 days’ notice. The plan also ends restrictions on the Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile, ICBM, program in just over 8 years, which means, within a decade, Iran can go back to developing warheads that could reach the United States.

Mr. Speaker, they cheat on every single deal they make. Why would you negotiate with someone you don’t trust? Why would you give someone you don’t trust and who had a track record, give them everything they wanted?

Well, even worse, reports have indicated that there is also a side deal, a

side deal between Iran and the IAEA, that allows Iranians to inspect their own nuclear sites. Mr. Speaker, this will be like a person in college or any school being allowed to grade their own test. That is not the right way you handle international affairs. When the Republicans say you negotiate with weakness, this is exactly what we are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not clear what the American people would get from this deal. What is clear is that this deal will empower a stronger Iran to be the strongest country in that region, to be competitive against the United States, and to have everything they want to pursue nuclear weapons in their future.

So what is at stake here? Congress is being asked to join in this deal. They are being asked to endorse a plan that would eventually legitimize the Iranian nuclear state and fund its terrorism activities and to support our President in doing this.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. We are going to debate it. We are going to pass this legislation, and we are going to put this House on record of where we would be.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on the Iran nuclear agreement has been touted by the majority as the most consequential of our careers, maybe even our lifetimes. We have had months of consideration, hearings, questions, open debate following rules and customs of the House, more or less, surrounding the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran, an agreement carefully negotiated by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, and Germany to curb Iran’s nuclear activities.

As you listen this morning, you would think this was a negotiation between Barack Obama and the Ayatollah. Apparently, that is all that they want to think. The other countries played major roles here, and they are the most important economies in the world. This agreement is the best available option for peacefully and verifiably cutting off Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon.

On Tuesday evening, the Committee on Rules had a hearing on the third floor of the Capitol that lasted over 3 hours, and there was testimony from chairs and the ranking members of the relevant committees. We had a robust discussion and a healthy back-and-forth. We prepared for the rule debate.

We had our statements written, but 12 hours later, the dissident wing of the majority’s party emerged from a neighborhood bar, the Tortilla Coast, with a different path in mind. They rendered all our work moot, and the House was forced into a holding pattern all day

yesterday while Republican dissidents brought their party to its knees.

Once again, instead of regular order, in a perversion of our legislative process, we are thrown into chaos by a majority chasing its tail in a last-minute ploy, throwing together three bills that might as well have been scribbled on the back of a cocktail napkin.

These bills trivialize our institution. They have been whipped up in an afternoon to mollify the disgruntled wing of the majority’s party that shows no interest in governing. Their only goal with this trio of bills—which are contradictory, let me add, and I will say more about that later—is to feed the monster seething within their own ranks.

There has been no committee action on these bills. There has been no debate. There has been no time even to consider them.

Now, why didn’t we do them in our regularly scheduled Tuesday night meeting? It is because we didn’t even know they existed. Instead of addressing an issue of international global importance, we are occupied with the Republican Conference’s internal politics, and it is an embarrassment to this country.

This dog-and-pony show has turned Congress into a stage to play out the internal drama that diminishes our constitutional role. If the majority cannot devise a process for a measure on which they agree, on which they have their vote unanimously, if they can’t devise a process for a measure like that, I shudder to think what is coming with act two, which we are hurtling toward, because we are days away from a government shutdown.

We have no budget; our troops would not get paid; flights would be canceled, and what is more, the last time we had a Republican-inflicted shutdown, \$24 billion was lost to our economy at a time when we were struggling even more than now to regain it.

Even so, here we are, forced to join in yet another pointless exercise, and the Senate has said they will not take up these bills, and so this nuclear agreement will be implemented, which leaves the Republican Party with the majority in both houses, which they control, with no consensus.

What is more, keeping Iran from building a nuclear weapon is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to silence the drumbeats of war. There is no opportunity to renegotiate this. With all you have heard this morning about “this won’t do” and “we can’t have it” and “it is awful,” have you heard a single alternative? There is not one. The possibility of peace in a powder keg region of the world should be considered carefully.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1946, shortly after World War II ended, when the horrors of global violence were fresh in our collective memory, Albert Einstein asserted that: “The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus, we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe.”

Very rarely do we have an opportunity to stop that so-called drift toward catastrophe, but we do with this measure, and all of our allies have agreed to it. Only we are trying to hold it up.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action provides for unparalleled access to Iran's nuclear facilities. The agreement blocks all four possible pathways to a bomb. Contrary to falsehoods reported by the media, Iran will not be self-monitoring.

The inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency have unprecedented and continuous daily monitoring authority, and it is so easy, they tell me, to detect the radioactive material if they were to break this agreement.

Only certain sanctions will be lifted. Many will be kept in place, for example, what they do with terrorist organizations and supplying arms to other people. We are continuing those sanctions. If Iran fails to comply, all the nations involved in the negotiation have said they will be reinstituted by using a snapback provision which is in the bill.

Let me repeat that. We have heard from ambassadors of almost all those nations yesterday saying that their countries would absolutely comply with reintroducing the sanctions.

Now, let me remind people that should the Iranians attempt to conceal their work, even a nanogram—a billionth of a gram—of dust of nuclear work is detected.

Retired American military leaders, former Secretaries of State from both parties, the Israeli security professionals, and even faith leaders have come out in full support of this accord. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Secretary of State under President George W. Bush, retired four-star General Colin Powell, called this agreement "remarkable."

The former head of Israel's intelligence and special operations agency, the Mossad, Efraim Halevy, supports the agreement as well. He said recently to PBS' Judy Woodruff: "I believe this agreement closes the roads and blocks the road to Iranian nuclear military capabilities for at least a decade." That is not a trivial thing.

Domestic faith leaders have implored this Congress to follow the Old Testament creed to "seek peace and pursue it."

The agreement was painstakingly negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry, Deputy Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz representing the United States. When hailing this agreement, Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to both Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush, said of this team: "There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Moniz . . . when he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to a fissile material . . . responsible people listen."

It is now clear, based on the declared supporters in the Senate, that the effort to kill this agreement will end in the upper Chamber, and the accord will survive and be implemented.

Regardless of that certainty, the House majority has nonetheless thrown us into disarray. We will vote today on two bills, another one tomorrow. It was decided that, first, there will be a bill to say that the President cannot lift the sanctions and a bill on side agreements that they think are out there that nobody else knows about, and then the most interesting one is the bill tomorrow will be to approve it.

You have already had all this discussion on "we won't have it, we can't have it, the bill will not survive." They are going to approve it; but just in case, because the Senate won't take up an approval message, they kept another rule last night.

First, they did away with it, then they put it back so that, next week, we can come up with a disapproval rule; but by next Thursday, it is all over, the 60 days are up, and the President may go ahead with the agreement.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and support this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Harding Township, New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule before us and in strong opposition to the Iranian nuclear agreement.

While there may be many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality. The Iranian nuclear agreement fails to achieve its critical objective, blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with an international endorsement of an industrial scale nuclear weapons program.

My colleagues, we must not forget where it started, with the President declaring Iran must never be allowed to achieve a nuclear weapons capability, but to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators have made some inexcusable and dangerous concessions on inspections and verification and on Iran's missile defense program and their access to conventional weapons.

Worse than that, Iran will economically be strengthened by early relief from sanctions, providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Force and its global terrorism network.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict this deal will lead to more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our own part, the agreement talks about the normalization of eco-

nomic relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement in good faith based on mutual respect; but how can there be respect for a regime that actively promotes regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase "death to America" as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our national defense. This deal is bad for our national defense. I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not.

It is a vote of conscience far and above politics, and that is why I will vote "no" on the motion to approve this disastrous agreement and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rule before us and in opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

While there are many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality: the Iranian nuclear deal fails to achieve its critical objective: blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with international endorsement of an industrial-scale nuclear weapons program.

My Colleagues, we must not forget where we started: with the President declaring that Iran must never be allowed to achieve a nuclear weapons capability. But to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators had to make numerous and serious concessions:

They dropped snap "anywhere, anytime inspections";

We will not receive credible information about the potential military dimensions of Iran's previous nuclear research efforts;

Existing restrictions on Iran's ballistic missile program will cease;

International sanctions targeting Iran's support for global terrorism and human rights violations have been eased.

Each and every one of these important elements was discarded as the Obama Administration worked to achieve its landmark deal with Iran.

The reality is that this agreement will provide a legal path to a nuclear weapons capability to a country that remains a rogue state and has violated a whole series of international obligations and U.N. Security Council resolutions. Simply put, the Iranians have cheated before. We would be fools to assume they will not cheat again.

While the President insists "this deal is not built on trust," key verification provisions are buried in confidential side agreements that allow Iran to conduct its own inspections of nuclear weapons research facilities. This brings me to the conclusion that we would be better off with no deal, rather than this deal.

Worse than that, Iran will be economically strengthened by early relief from sanctions—providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Forces and its global terrorism network. If Iran violates the agreement, building international support for new sanctions would take too long to be effective. And furthermore, our allies appear to be more interested in their own trade and commercial interests than in halting Iran's nuclear aspirations.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict that this deal will lead to even more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our part, the agreement talks about normalization of economic relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement “in good faith . . . based on mutual respect.”

But how can there be respect for a regime that actively instigates regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase “Death to America” as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, the first responsibility of each Member of this House is to provide for our national defense—and that includes confronting the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism everywhere. If we fail to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon this year, next year or in the next decade, we will have allowed the weakening of that defense. And we will have failed our children and future generations.

I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not. It is a vote of conscience far above and beyond politics. And that’s why I will vote “yes” on the resolution of disapproval.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to thank my colleagues. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I agree with many of the points that you made. This is a vote of conscience for all of us.

The question is not whether we trust Iran. We don’t. The question is not whether we want Iran to have any pathway to a nuclear weapon. Proponents of this agreement—I am one—and opponents of this agreement—there are many, my friend, Mr. STEWART—don’t want Iran to have a nuclear weapon. This question about trust, we have got to step back a minute.

One of the fundamental challenges that a strong and confident country faces is to secure its national security. That requires the Commander in Chief, whose fundamental responsibility is to exercise his judgment about what will work to increase our security, to enter into negotiations with adversaries; and there may be no greater adversary to the United States, to our allies, particularly Israel, than Iran.

Keep in mind, President Kennedy negotiated with the Soviet Union after one of their leaders said they will bury this country, and he did that, and it turned out that he was right to limit nuclear proliferation. President Nixon went to China when it was Red China, an absolute adversary of this country and our way of life, and it has worked to the benefit of the national security of this country, and President Reagan did the same.

The fundamental question here is not at all about whether we trust Iran. We don’t trust Iran. It is not about whether you negotiate with people you trust. You have to negotiate with people that are your adversaries.

The question is whether the terms and conditions of this agreement that the President is recommending, along with our very close allies—Germany, France, Great Britain, and Russia and China—will improve our national security and that of our allies, particularly Israel. My judgment is it will.

Number one, there is no pathway for Iran to have a nuclear weapon under this agreement.

Number two, this is not based on trust. It is based on distrust and strong verification provisions that will give us a heads-up if there is any effort of Iran not to comply.

Third, we have the opportunity to snap back the sanctions all of us supported that brought Iran to the table. We don’t have to get a majority vote; we can do that unilaterally.

□ 1300

Then, finally, we do have to ask the question of not whether this is the perfect agreement—undoubtedly, there could be a better agreement that might give more satisfaction and security and peace of mind to all of us—it is a question of this agreement or no agreement. That is the question that we face.

The weight of the opinion and judgment is that, if we repudiate this agreement, the sanction regime that we constructed on the leadership of President George Bush and President Barack Obama would dissolve. What happens then? Iran gets the money and they have no restraint on their ability to get the bomb.

I urge us to support this agreement in the national security interest of the United States of America, Israel, and our allies.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today not to speak for Republicans, but to speak for America.

When 80 percent of the American people say “no” to this deal, how can America’s House, how can we who have been elected by the American people, come here and say, “You are wrong, and we are right”?

A vote for this deal is a vote against the American people. History tells us that in 1938, Chamberlain came home from meeting with Hitler and said, “Peace in our time.” Judas went to the Last Supper, pointed to the Lord, and they gave him 30 pieces of silver. We are not even getting 30 pieces of silver.

President Obama says this is the best deal we could get. In my lifetime, anytime anybody comes back from a negotiation and says, “This is the best we could do,” it means they lost. They did not get what they wanted. They got the best they could. In this case, it is the losing hand.

This deal endangers the safety, security, and stability of not only America,

but the entire world. This deal comes with absolutely no accountability, no verification, and no enforceability.

I ask you, how can you sit in America’s House, when the President’s number one responsibility is to protect the American people, and say, “This is the best we could get.” This gives the American people nothing. This gives Iran everything.

Now, in just 24 hours, we are going to commemorate the 14th anniversary of a terrorist attack on the United States, and we are going to grant the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world \$150 billion to show how much we have turned a deaf ear to the cries of the dead and a blind eye to the destruction of America that day.

To sit here and even begin to think that somehow this is good for America is false. To try and sell this to the American people is a lie. We are sacrificing the safety of 330 million Americans for the legacy of one man. That is not what America wants. That is not who America is. That is not who America should ever allow itself to be.

And to sit here and listen to somehow we have not done our job; ladies and gentlemen, our main job is to protect the American people. It always was. It always is. This has morphed into something greater than that; I understand that. But at the base of the day, it is to protect the American people.

And let me tell you, as tomorrow we have dawn and the sun comes up, all you have to do is turn your ears to the east and our enemies will be shouting, “death to the Great Satan,” “death to America,” “death to Israel.” And the Supreme Leader, himself, says that, within 25 years, there will be no Israel.

The hypocrisy to stand before this House today, America’s House, and sell the American people down the river because of one man’s legacy is a travesty of who we are. And it is more than that. It flies in the face of the 1.4 million Americans in uniform who have given their life to give us this opportunity to defend this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Almost every observer, even the host of candidates seeking the Republican Presidential nomination, recognize that President Bush’s invasion of Iraq was a foreign policy disaster for which so many military families are continuing to pay a high price. And American taxpayers will ultimately pay over a trillion dollars for that failure, spurred on by some of the speeches like the one we just heard.

So we look next door to Baghdad, at Tehran, and we see a despicable government there, just as there was one in Baghdad. We have ample intelligence evidence that that despicable government was pursuing a nuclear weapon program that is unacceptable to us. And we try to learn: Is there a way for America to use its other power, its diplomatic power, to stop that? Because

we know our use of military power did not accomplish positive foreign policy objectives by itself in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

We found an approach that, in fact, had strong bipartisan support—imposing strong economic sanctions on the Iranians. It didn't work so well originally, the first time that I and almost everyone else in this House voted for it, because America couldn't go-it-alone any more than it could be successful in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

But when we brought the rest of the world along, including some people that have been our adversaries, like Russia and China, to join in this sanctions regime, it finally forced Iran to the table to begin to deal with the critical elements of this nuclear weapon program.

Step by step, through very hard negotiations, by bringing the rest of the world along to force those economic sanctions on Iran—all of which I supported—they began to move forward on trying to resolve this issue through diplomacy, through acting that way, rather than bombing first and asking questions later, as some of these folks have advocated. At every step in that process, as we approached an interim agreement, we had an “object first, read later” approach from those who are pushing this rule.

The interim agreement was announced. They rejected it that night before they had even read it. It proved that their objections were totally unfounded: We gained more in terms of intelligence; we came to understand better the Iranian program; and we put a stop to it in that interim agreement. Our families are safer today because that agreement was adopted.

And we come along to about March of this year, and the same folks that are advocating this rule were out here telling us there was one thing this Congress had to do: It had to have the power to disapprove this agreement if it did not feel the final agreement met the objectives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is how we began this week with the resolution of disapproval. But yesterday, they brought their self-styled foreign policy experts to Washington—Sarah Palin, Glenn Beck, Donald Trump—and they said a resolution of disapproval is not enough.

So today, Republicans have abandoned the only tool they had to stop this agreement—a resolution of disapproval; that is not even in this resolution—and they are off on a three-pronged approach to satisfy the most extreme views that prefer to use war as the first instrument instead of the last instrument.

We have a choice in this Congress, and it is the choice of using the strong power of America, with verification, to prevent this program rather than call-

ing on more military families to sacrifice for an unnecessary endeavor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we will do everything in our power to try and stop this bad deal; you are darn right we will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Farmington, Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Intelligence Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and a member of the United States Air Force for years and years, a veteran of this great Nation.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that gracious introduction.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is deeply, deeply flawed; and when you talk to our friends across the aisle, in moments of honesty, they will admit that it is deeply flawed.

This is the most important national security question of our generation. We have got to get this right, and we simply haven't done that yet.

If I could elaborate on my background that leads me to this conclusion, as the chairman said, I sit on the House Intelligence Committee. For 14 years, I was an Air Force pilot. I flew aircraft that carried nuclear weapons. I worked for the implementation of various nuclear treaties. I understand that for any treaty to work, there has to be a modicum of trust. There has to be a kernel of trust between the two parties.

Let me ask you this: Do you think we can trust the Iranians?

I asked Secretary Kerry on two occasions to give me a single example of where the Iranians have worked with us or our allies in any positive fashion, and he could not do that. But I can give you a long list of where they have worked against us, where they have created death and chaos: Hezbollah, Hamas, assassinations in Central America. Hundreds of Americans have been killed and maimed because of the Iranian-backed Shia militia. This is what they do. And we are supposed to trust them?

And by the way, I believe they are going to cheat, because they are cheating even now. In the last few months, they tried to buy prohibited equipment from Germany. They refuse to answer questions from the IAEA even now.

Which brings me to my second question: Do you think we can trust this President?

I would ask you to give me a single example of what you consider a foreign policy success of this administration—give me a single example—and then let me give you a long list of foreign policy failures, beginning with China claiming much of the South China Sea; with Russia, after the reset, going into Crimea, controlling much of eastern Ukraine now, even now building military posts in Syria.

We went into Libya and created chaos and walked away. We snatched defeat from the jaws of victory in Iraq. We are doing the same thing in Yemen, the same thing in Afghanistan. Why should we trust this President?

I believe that most people think this agreement is doomed to fail; and I believe that when it does, we now have to turn towards the question of: What do we do when we have an entirely nuclearized Middle East? When we have four or five countries in the next few years that have nuclear weapons there, how are we going to deal with that, coming from a President who declared it was his goal to see the elimination of all nuclear weapons across the globe? It is a terrible irony that he is going to preside over the greatest and most dramatic expansion of nuclear capabilities in the most chaotic part of the world, that he will preside over that, and that will be his foreign policy legacy.

We need to defeat this agreement while we still can.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this extremely convoluted rule as well as the underlying legislation.

When I was a child in the 1980s, I remember my mother taking me to Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament rallies. I recall wondering why America possesses enough nuclear weapons to blow up the entire world at least seven times over. As an adult, I have never succeeded in finding a satisfactory answer to why we want to be able to blow up the world seven times.

Now, we are all here because the potential for nuclear war is one of the greatest threats to the future of humanity and perhaps to the future of life on the planet itself. That is why this agreement to make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, does not acquire nuclear weapons is so important.

Let's be clear about what this deal is and what it isn't.

It is not a peace deal. It is not a deal that calls on us to trust Iran or like Iran. In fact, the very reason we want to make sure that Iran doesn't develop nuclear weapons is we see how much damage they caused through their mischief-making through support of Hezbollah and others on the conventional front. If that were compounded by nuclear capabilities, it would significantly increase the chance of global destruction.

This agreement is based on verification and enforceability. It is built on extensive electronic monitoring and unprecedented access for international investigators at known or suspected Iranian nuclear sites.

Of course, there are things in this deal that I would change or you would change. No deal is perfect. But perfection can't be our standard or we would never be able to support anything around here. Our job is to consider if this deal is better than the alternatives.

□ 1315

If Congress rejects this agreement and it leads to a nuclear Iran, what then?

It was multilateral sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table, not American sanctions alone; and it is clear that Russia and China will likely grant Iran sanctions relief, regardless of what the U.S. decides to do. We also worry about the dedication of our European allies in this regard.

With sanctions disappearing and Iran's money being unfrozen, the deal is moving forward. Shouldn't we want this agreement to proceed with the oversight of the United States of America, to make sure that Iran abides by the very letter of this agreement not to develop nuclear weapons?

Instead of standing in its way, we, in Congress, should play a leading role in the implementation and rigid enforcement of this deal to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

This agreement is an unprecedented opportunity to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program cold and make the world a safer place. Of all our options, it is the one most likely to succeed in preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues not to stand in the way of this important deal, to make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, has a terrible record of human rights violations at home, and even just 2 days ago said that the State of Israel wouldn't last 25 years.

It is important that we ensure that they don't have access to the nuclear weapons that will allow them to carry through with their terrorist goals.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Windsor, Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, President Obama negotiated with a band of villains. The President believed Iran would change their ways because of his kind and forgiving nature, but we have seen Iranian hypocrisy far too long to believe they can change. It is time to face reality and prevent them, at all costs, from acquiring nuclear capability.

Iran's leaders promised to wipe Israel off the map. They deny the Holocaust and refer to our country as the Great Satan. The Ayatollah even takes to Twitter to call for Israel's annihilation.

Iran's actions are as dishonorable as their rhetoric. The administration has negotiated with Iran on nuclear nonproliferation as if they were an honorable country with honorable intentions, but it is certainly not honorable when our Department of State lists Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism, and no honorable country would occupy that unworthy distinction for the past 30 years, nor would an honorable country supply terrorists around the world with weapons to kill Americans and Israeli. In fact, Iran supplied IEDs that killed and maimed American soldiers and marines in the Iraq war.

On the day we remember the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil, we are going to vote on whether or not to allow billions of dollars of funding to the world's largest state sponsor of terror. This deal is, at best, delusional and, at worst, despicable.

Iran is in pursuit of a nuclear weapon, and their intention for the United States is death.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote in favor of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the agreement reached by Secretary Kerry and the international community because I believe there is no better alternative for preventing Iran from immediately developing a nuclear weapon.

Since the first sanctions were imposed on Iran a decade ago, I have supported tough economic measures as a means to bring Iran to the negotiating table. In that respect, the sanctions worked, but sanctions alone will not stop Iran from moving toward nuclear weapons.

After strenuous review of the July 14 agreement and all its annexes, I have reached the conclusion that the agreement is the best option available today for keeping nuclear weapons out of Iranian hands. Under the agreement, Iran is bound "under no circumstances ever to seek, develop or acquire nuclear weapons."

Among other things, Iran must reduce its active centrifuges by two-thirds, give up 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and reconfigure the Arak reactor so it cannot produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The number of inspectors in Iran will triple. They will gain full access to nuclear facilities, including the entire uranium supply chain, at any time. This is indeed the most intrusive inspection regime of any nonproliferation agreement in U.S. history.

That is important because it will give the United States and the international community far greater insight into the regime's behavior and enable us to monitor them closely.

It is true that Iran may try to cheat, but that is exactly why we need this agreement. With severe restrictions and an aggressive inspections regime in place, we will be much more likely to discover any violations.

In that event, the United States will be authorized to reimpose sanctions on Iran immediately, and that applies not just to the U.S. sanctions, but to U.N. sanctions as well.

In summary, this agreement comprises harsh restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities, a strong monitoring system, and tough penalties for violation.

A group of 29 leading American scientists, including Nobel laureates, has called it "a technically sound, stringent, and innovative deal that will pro-

vide the necessary assurance in the coming decades and more that Iran is not developing nuclear weapons."

If we walk away from this agreement, the only remaining alternative is military action. We have been down that path for 15 years, and we have seen the grave consequences of not allowing diplomatic efforts to move forward.

Ronald Reagan said of the Soviet Union: "Trust, but verify."

This agreement is not rooted in trust but in our ability to verify compliance and to deal with enforcement. I believe it meets the goals of our negotiations to deny a dangerous Iranian regime access to a nuclear weapon.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Sugar Land, Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst parts of President Obama's agreement with Iran is that it opens the door to nuclear bombs blowing up right here in America.

This man is a terrorist from Iran. His name is Manssor Arbabsiar. He comes from a family of hate.

In 2011, he approached the notorious Los Zetas drug cartel with a scheme to kill the Ambassador from Saudi Arabia right here in this city. He offered them \$1.5 million for that hit. Luckily, we caught him.

President Obama's agreement gives Iran at least \$100 billion to hire Los Zetas and others to unleash nuclear material and death on innocent Americans. We caught them once. Will we catch them again?

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule today and tomorrow. Vote to reject President Obama's agreement with Iran.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our ranking member for yielding me time and also for your leadership on this vital global peace and national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of three bills surrounding the nuclear agreement negotiated by this administration and the P5+1.

Make no mistake, these bills are nothing more than yet another attempt to purposefully and deliberately thwart the Iran deal.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have the same goal, to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Now, as one who has been involved in many nuclear nonproliferation efforts since the 1970s, I am convinced that this deal brings us much closer to a nuclear-weapons-free Iran.

I believe that the President negotiated with our P5+1 partners—while not perfect, this deal achieves that goal. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action cuts off all pathways to a bomb and ensures robust oversight and inspection. It is the best way to promote

regional security and global peace, and the majority of Americans agreed.

According to a recent University of Maryland poll, 55 percent said that Congress should get behind this agreement. That is why we need to be clear on the ramifications of rejecting the deal.

If the United States walks away, we will be walking away alone. As United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent Politico op-ed: "If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door number two. No do over. No rewrite of the deal on the table."

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners and will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran.

Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate their weapons programs with no oversight, and it will significantly undermine our ability to engage with our partners on critical issues like addressing international terrorism.

Simply put, rejecting this deal would isolate the United States and would put us back on the path to war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. The Scriptures do say let us study war no more, so that is why it is critical for us to support the President and our diplomats and give this deal a chance to succeed.

This is a defining moment for our country and for the world. Let us continue to work for peace because the military option, that is always there. Let us work for a world worthy of our children and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fairhope, Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and in strong opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has created a false choice by claiming the only alternative to this deal is war.

First of all, this deal itself can most definitely lead to war. By giving one of our biggest enemies access to nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and billions of dollars in sanctions relief, we are effectively giving Iran the tools they need to live out their dream of bringing "death to America."

The other flaw in the President's logic is that there are actually other alternatives than war. What about a better deal that includes anytime, anywhere inspections? What about increasing the sanctions which were clearly working to begin with? What about requiring the release of Americans held as political prisoners in Iran? These are clear alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House, so I think it is critically important that we actually listen to the people. Last month, I held over 15 town-hall meetings all across my district. At each and every stop, someone asked me what Congress is going to do to stop the Iran nuclear deal.

Just look at the public opinion polls. Only 21 percent of those surveyed in a recent poll said they approve of this agreement. That is less than one in four Americans who believe this is a good deal.

I implore my colleagues to put the opinion of the American people over loyalty to some political party. I ask my colleagues to listen to our Nation's military leaders, who have made clear the serious consequences of giving Iran access to ICBMs, instead of party bosses.

I plead with my colleagues to look past the short-term legacy of our President and, instead, look at the long-term ramifications this deal will have on the safety and security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater responsibility of this House than to do everything we can to keep the American people safe.

With that in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to stand strong and oppose this deal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran nuclear agreement and in strong opposition to this convoluted rule and process.

Today, the House should have already completed several hours of debate on the Iran deal. Instead, we have before us a convoluted process with three measures that won't go anywhere in the Senate and will never reach the President's desk.

The fact is that the President has the votes to move this historic agreement forward. We should be having a serious debate and moving toward a vote in a timely fashion.

□ 1330

Instead, House Republicans have cooked up a series of votes to needlessly drag this process out and appeal to their extremist base.

We all know how serious the Iran nuclear agreement is for the security of the Middle East, the United States, and the world.

After reading and listening to many diverse views, I believe it is the strongest available option to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and prevent yet another war.

These negotiations were never meant to solve all of the problems that we have with Iran. Their purpose was clear from the beginning: to shut down the pathways available to Iran to develop and produce a nuclear bomb, period.

Quite simply, is it better to have an Iran capable of producing a nuclear weapon by early next year or is it better to shut down that capability for the next 10 to 15 years and even longer?

And let me be clear. The agreement is set up to ensure that Iran remains a nuclear weapon-free state with mechanisms for inspections and verifications that remain permanently in place.

Now I know that some hoped that a "better deal" might somehow be renegotiated if we just keep increasing sanctions and threaten—or even use—military force against Iran.

But we already know that 10 years of sanctions and military threats only gave us a significant increase in Iran's nuclear capacity and that the number of centrifuges needed to produce weapons-grade enriched uranium also increased.

Only when serious negotiations began 2 years ago did we see Iran's program stopped and then rolled back. The final agreement degrades even further Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon, blocks all pathways for Iran to acquire the materials needed to develop a bomb, and imposes the most comprehensive inspections regime of any nuclear arms control agreement to date.

In return, Iran will receive sanctions relief that is phased in over the next decade, dependent on Iran's compliance.

Do I trust Iran? Certainly not. Iran doesn't trust us either. But, again, that is the whole point of negotiations: for nations that don't trust one another to sit down and to hammer out a deal that all parties can live with and abide by.

Nelson Mandela is credited with saying, "The best weapon is to sit down and talk." This means compromise, for all parties to get something out of the final agreement.

For Iran, that is sanctions relief. For the world, that means an Iran without a nuclear weapon. It is not based on trust. It is based on tough inspections and verification.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an accord between just the U.S. and Iran. Six of the world's major powers—Russia, China, France, Germany, the U.K., and the U.S.—hammered out this deal with Iran.

If the U.S. walks away now, we will never be able to put the pieces back together or get these nations to take a risk with us again. Without this agreement, Iran could simply return to developing a nuclear weapon.

After 2 years of arduous negotiations, why would the U.S. insult the very nations whose cooperation and commitment we need to ensure Iran's compliance?

Why would we undermine our international standing as a good-faith negotiating partner not just on this agreement, but on every other negotiation we are engaged in now and in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the IAEA inquiry into Iran's past nuclear

activities is a side deal. It is its own separate bilateral agreement. It neither affects nor delays the P5+1 agreement's rigorous inspections and verification process or Iran's obligation to significantly degrade and dismantle its nuclear infrastructure before getting any sanctions relief.

But, quite frankly, the U.S. long ago reached its own conclusions about Iran's nuclear activities. We believe that, if left unchecked, Iran would soon acquire enough weapons-grade plutonium and highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb.

It is why we approved U.S. nuclear-related sanctions and supported similar international sanctions, and it is why the White House began serious multilateral negotiations with Iran to cut off every pathway Iran might have to make a nuclear weapon. And we were successful. We were successful.

Mr. Speaker, my support for the comprehensive agreement is not something I give reluctantly or grudgingly. I am proud to support this deal and to cast my vote in support of the resolution of approval.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing this rule, in supporting the resolution approving this historic agreement, and in rejecting both the Roskam and the Pompeo bills that seek to delay its implementation.

This is a good deal. It deserves our support.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the August break, I talked to a lot of folks. Many of them were fearful. They were fearful about national security. And it focused on the on deal, the Iranian deal that we are here for today.

The Iranian deal, Mr. Speaker, is bad for America. It is bad for Israel. It is bad for the Middle East. But, oh, what a deal for Iran.

If we approve this deal, there will be singing and dancing in the streets in Iran, especially with the High Ayatollah leading the dancing. Why? Because it is wonderful for Iran.

The deal certifies a nuclear Iran, eventually. We can argue over when, but they are going to get nuclear weapons. How lovely is that. Is the world going to be safer because of that? No.

We need to see the world for what it is. Iran is a wolf in wolf's clothing. They make absolutely no secret about they want us dead.

They want Israel dead first. They were preaching this while we are working on this peace, peace, peace at any price deal, talking about how they want to destroy us.

So why don't we just look at the law right now. We have heard a little bit

about a side deal. Secretary Kerry was before our Foreign Affairs Committee.

I asked him about a side deal that came up about the IAEA deal with Iran. He said he hadn't read it, he has been briefed on it.

Congress needs to read the side deals before we ever vote to approve this deal. We have to read the fine print, like all of us are supposed to do when we sign a contract.

Now let's read what the law says. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. The President is obligated by law—the law he signed—to provide Congress “the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.”

That is in the law. I haven't seen the side deal. I haven't seen anybody in Congress that has seen the side deal.

The law the President signed says we are to see all these side deals, agreements, before we even vote on whether or not to approve this deal; otherwise, the clock doesn't start ticking for the 60-day approval requirement.

So show us the side deal. Let us read it. I think Congress maybe has had enough embarrassment over the years voting on laws where we haven't seen all of the information before we voted on it. Show us the side agreement. Let us go from there.

Of course the deal in itself is a bad deal for all of us. I don't understand why we are giving \$150 billion to Iran while we have got \$47 billion in claims by Americans against Iran for terrorist activities. Why don't we give them the money first?

And I know I am out of time. But let's not approve the deal. Let's vote for the rule and make sure, before we ever see any vote on the agreement, we see the side deal.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the Members that the gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentlewoman, I have three or four more speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss what I believe will be one of the most consequential votes in the history of this body.

A fundamental duty of the Federal Government—so much that it is enshrined in the preamble to our Constitution—is to provide for the common defense.

We must ask ourselves: Will this deal enhance the safety and security of the American people? The answer is clearly no. On the contrary, it imperils the United States and our allies around the world.

Look only to those who know Iran best, its neighbors, who universally oppose the deal. Why? Because it is built on trusting a regime that has cheated on international agreements time and again and because it will launch a nuclear arms race in the most unstable region in the world.

So today we have a choice. To me, the choice is clear. We can support this deal and stand with a regime that spreads terror around the world, leads its people in chants of “Death to America,” and whose leaders refer to our country as the “Great Satan,” or we reject the deal and stand strong as a country, resolute in our pursuit of freedom and justice, stand with our allies, like Israel, and stand with the American people, who overwhelmingly opposed this deal.

I know where I stand. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this deal and sending a clear signal to the world that we will not accept a nuclear Iran.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a gentleman with compassion and healing, a gentleman who is a physician, a gentleman on from the Education and the Workforce and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation expressing disapproval of this proposed nuclear deal with Iran.

Forty years ago I was a young soldier just south of the militarized zone in Korea when they did not have a nuclear weapon. Now that they have joined the nuclear community, does the world feel safer with a rogue nation having a nuclear weapon?

I pose the question: What is in this agreement for America? Does it make us safer?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This affects all of us. It affects the Middle East, where our closest ally feels endangered, and I agree that they are.

And I pose the narrative question: What is it about “death to America” this administration does not understand?

The President presents a false narrative: war or this agreement. I could not disagree more. The sanctions brought the Iranians to the negotiating table.

What kind of an agreement did we negotiate? What happened to “anytime, anyplace” inspections? What happened to Americans actually being on the inspection team?

I think everyone, every thoughtful person, realizes this just slows the process down. But, ultimately, the Iranians will develop a nuclear weapon.

I support the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Miami, Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we need to ask ourselves if this nuclear deal with Iran makes the United States safer. Does it make Israel safer? Does it make the world safer?

As a result of this deal, Iran will be nuclear-capable, and its neighbors will not be complacent knowing that Iran can't produce a nuclear weapon.

The billions of dollars that the regime is set to receive will undoubtedly go towards building its military capabilities, not to mention its support for terror and other illicit activities.

Because this deal jeopardizes Iran's neighbors, the administration is promising Gulf countries military arms sales to defend against the increased Iranian threat.

We then will be the major proliferator of nuclear and conventional arms in the Middle East. Do we really believe that arming an extremely unstable and violent Middle East region to the teeth and having nuclear-capable Iran right there in the middle will make us or the world safer?

The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker. This deal is dangerous. It is bad public policy. We must oppose it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois, (Mr. ROSKAM), the distinguished gentleman who spent several hours, 4 or 5 hours, with us in the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kerry came and gave a briefing to a closed session of Congress. Part of it was open for discussion. He said something provocative at the end. He said, "Folks, what is the alternative?"

And I said to him in a question and answer session, "You know, Mr. Secretary, for 2 years, the administration has been telling us that no deal is better than a bad deal. And if no deal is better than a bad deal, that means that there was an alternative."

Secretary Kerry, during that same briefing, said that he walked away from the deal three times with the Iranians. And I said, "Secretary, when you walked away from the deal, that means that there was an alternative."

So the administration does not get to argue today, Mr. Speaker, to this Congress or to the American people that there is no alternative. There is an alternative. And this House is prepared to offer alternatives.

I appreciate Chairman SESSIONS. I appreciate the Rules Committee bringing forth this package of bills that we can begin to discuss getting us out from underneath a disastrous deal.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

□ 1345

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and against the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot in good conscience accept a deal that is laden with secretive side agreements brokered by this administration, nor can we possibly grant \$150 billion to the world's foremost sponsor of terror and, in the process, turn our back on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this bad deal that the Supreme Leader of Iran now is publicly emboldened to say that Israel will not exist in 25 years and that terror will continue to plague the Middle East, Israel, and the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach September 11, I would ask my colleagues to please join me in rejecting this bad deal, and let's defeat terrorism rather than advance it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deal with Iran. Iran is one of the world's largest state sponsors of terrorism.

It provides military and financial support to groups responsible for the deaths of Americans and our allies. In addition, the regime is working to undermine governments across the Middle East, including Iran, Syria, Yemen, and Lebanon.

As Iranians rally behind "death to America," I am left to wonder what other options we have but stopping them from obtaining the most dangerous weapons on Earth. Unfortunately, I believe this deal falls way short of that goal.

I pledge and will be working with my colleagues to make sure that we oppose this deal and that we find other alternatives.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, the weight of this decision falls heavily on this Chamber. Instead of following regular order, the majority's insistence on governing by crisis has once more taken over, and we are thrown into disarray.

The Iran agreement is the best option that we have to curbing Iran's nuclear ambitions. People who know—nuclear scientists, ambassadors, people of the military—have all said, including Colin Powell, I may add, that this is a good bill, this is a good negotiation that will help to keep us safe.

The work ahead will be arduous, and it is going to take coordination with our international partners who also negotiated this agreement with us, but peace is always preferable to war.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues, my friends on the Rules

Committee, both Mr. MCGOVERN, Judge HASTINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER, for their participation today. I thank you very much, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for your professional attributes in this very, very difficult debate in the last few days that have taken many, many hours.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the deal that the administration negotiated is a disaster. We have talked about that all morning. Speaker after speaker after speaker after speaker spoke about the lack of benefit to the American people. It undermines American leadership abroad; it empowers the Iranian regime, and ignores what has been decades of policy where Americans would not deal with terrorists.

By overturning the decades of this bipartisan national defense policy, the administration is telling the world the United States is willing to negotiate with rogue states, those people that say "death to America," and give them exactly what they want. This will embolden future actors. It will limit the United States' ability to aggressively pursue sanctions against other countries.

The rest of the world will take note of our weakness. This is not leading; this is weakness. If the United States is willing to lift sanctions against Iran, we will unilaterally limit our ability to resolve issues through democracy, diplomacy, and through peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop this deal, which is why Republicans are on the floor today. We invite all of our colleagues to vote with us because it is the right thing, the adoption of this rule. Obviously, the lengthy debate we are going to have today is going to lead us to the conclusion that the underlying piece of legislation must be properly voted on.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has sold our nation's security for some magic beans. This Iran deal is a bad deal for our national security. It is a bad deal for our allies—particularly Israel.

Removing sanctions against ballistic missiles and conventional arms, would happen before Iran halts its nuclear activity. If we try to re-impose sanctions, Iran gets to walk away from the deal free of sanctions all together and keep its money and nuclear weapons.

The way I see it, Iran is the only one benefiting from this deal. President Obama wants people to believe this is the best deal possible. I say, if this is the best deal, then I don't want any deal at all.

I am voting NO on this deal because I made a promise to my children and grandchildren that I would fight to make this nation safer and stronger for the next generation. I cannot break that promise to my grandchildren. This is a bad deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote YES on the rule and NO on passage of this agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Griffith	Pearce
Aderholt	Grothman	Perry
Allen	Guinta	Pittenger
Amash	Guthrie	Pitts
Amodel	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hardy	Poliquin
Barletta	Harper	Pompeo
Barr	Harris	Posney
Barton	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Billirakis	Hensarling	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Black	Hill	Ribble
Blackburn	Holding	Rice (SC)
Blum	Hudson	Rigell
Bost	Huelskamp	Roby
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Byrne	Jolly	Rouzer
Calvert	Jones	Royce
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Russell
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Katko	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Coffman	King (IA)	Schweikert
Cole	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Kline	Sessions
Comstock	Knight	Shimkus
Conaway	Labrador	Shuster
Cook	LaMalfa	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Long	Stefanik
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Love	Stivers
Denham	Lucas	Stutzman
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Lummis	Thornberry
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Tipton
Dold	Marino	Troott
Donovan	Massie	Turner
Duffy	McCarthy	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Walden
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walker
Farenthold	McMorris	Walorski
Fincher	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fleming	Meehan	Wenstrup
Flores	Messer	Westerman
Forbes	Mica	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Fox	Miller (MI)	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Garrett	Mullin	Womack
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Gohmert	Newhouse	Yoho
Goodlatte	Noem	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nugent	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Nunes	Young (IN)
Granger	Olson	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Palmer	
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	

NAYS—186

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Aguilar	Gallego	O'Rourke
Ashford	Garamendi	Pallone
Bass	Graham	Pascarella
Beatty	Grayson	Payne
Becerra	Green, Al	Pelosi
Bera	Green, Gene	Perlmutter
Beyer	Grijalva	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hahn	Pingree
Bonamici	Hastings	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Himes	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Rangel
Bustos	Honda	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Richmond
Capps	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Israel	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Carney	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Sanchez, Loretta
Castro (TX)	Keating	Sarbanes
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kennedy	Schiff
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Clay	Kind	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Serrano
Clyburn	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cohen	Langevin	Sherman
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Sinema
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cooper	Lawrence	Slaughter
Costa	Lee	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Levin	Speier
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Takai
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowey	Titus
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DeLauro	(NM)	Torres
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Van Hollen
Deutsch	Lynch	Vargas
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doggett	Matsui	Vela
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Velázquez
Duckworth	McDermott	Visclosky
Edwards	McGovern	Walz
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Eshoo	Meng	Waters
Esty	Moore	Maxine
Farr	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	
	Nolan	

NOT VOTING—4

Cuellar	Maloney, Carolyn	Neugebauer
		Walberg

□ 1416

Messrs. FATTAH, NOLAN, BRADY of Pennsylvania, JEFFRIES, and CARSON of Indiana changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-58)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and,

together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2015, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2015.

FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 411

Whereas section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as enacted by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, defined the term “agreement” as meaning “an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.”;

Whereas section C(14) of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action requires Iran to implement the “Roadmap for Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran’s Nuclear Program” (referred to as

the “Roadmap”) which was agreed to with the IAEA;

Whereas the Roadmap identifies two separate, confidential agreements between the IAEA and Iran, one to address remaining outstanding issues related to “Possible Military Dimensions” of Iran’s nuclear program, and another “regarding the issue of Parchin”;

Whereas both of those agreements constitute side agreements within the meaning of section 135(h)(1);

Whereas section 135(a)(1)(A) requires the President to transmit the agreement, including any side agreements, as defined by section 135(h)(1) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership;

Whereas the Executive Communication numbered 2307 and captioned “A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter and attachments satisfying all requirements of Sec. 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Pub. L. 114-17), as received July 19, 2015”, did not include the text of either side agreement with the IAEA; and

Whereas the President has not subsequently transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the text of the separate agreements identified in the Roadmap: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 because the communication from the President did not constitute the agreement as defined by section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; and

(2) the period for review by Congress of nuclear agreements with Iran under section 135(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has not commenced because the agreement has not yet been transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 1 hour. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend and submit extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know why we are here to debate this resolution today. The bottom line is that, for those of us that were involved in this agreement, we always thought that international inspections were going to be done by international inspectors, not by the Iranians, not by those in the Iranian regime.

Whether you like the Iran agreement or not, one thing I think all Members

can agree on is that sound verification must be the bedrock of any viable agreement.

Iran cannot cheat and get away with it. And the reason this is an issue for us is because Iran has cheated on every past agreement. That is why the verification was so important.

The problem is key aspects of this verification agreement have not been presented to Congress to review. Indeed, there are two separate arrangements agreed to between Iran and an arm of the U.N. here, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

One is regarding the regime’s past bomb work, of which there are a thousand pages of evidence that the IAEA tell us about, and the other involves access to the Iranian military base at Parchin, where that evidence shows that that testing took place.

In order to fully assess the agreement, Members of Congress should have access to these documents. This is especially important since Iran will almost certainly treat these arrangements as setting a standard for future IAEA requests to access any suspicious sites, especially military sites, since they have made it clear nobody is going to their military sites.

Physical access by the IAEA to Parchin is critical to understanding Iran’s past bomb work. This is where “Iran constructed a large explosives containment vessel,” to quote the IAEA.

Why did they do it? To conduct experiments related to the development, say the international inspectors, of nuclear weapons. Iran has blocked the international inspectors’ access to Parchin for years.

In the meantime, we are told by those inspectors that they watch on spy satellite as Iran bulldozes and paves over this site and then paves over the site again.

If the international inspectors cannot attain a clear understanding of the experimentation that took place, then the United States will have great difficulty figuring out how long it would take Iran to rush toward a nuclear weapon.

In recent congressional testimony, administration officials expressed confidence in their access to suspicious sites that the agreement provides the IAEA.

Yet, these separate arrangements have the potential to seriously weaken our ability to verify the agreement as a whole even is true, that Iran is going to do self-inspections here, which is what Iran asserts.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Iranian negotiating behavior, as we know, is to pocket past concessions. And then what do they do? They push for more and more and more.

The separate arrangement agreed to between the IAEA and Iran regarding inspection of the facilities at Parchin will almost certainly be regarded by that government in Iran as a precedent for their IAEA access to future suspicious sites in Iran.

In other words, if you don’t get access to this site, you are not going to get access to other military sites where there is evidence that the same type of thing has occurred.

So if Iran won’t let international inspectors do the international inspecting today, what makes us think that the Iranians will allow intrusive terms to these agreements in the future after sanctions have been lifted when we find evidence of the next site?

I have little doubt that the side deals of today will become central to the agreement’s verification provisions tomorrow. This makes it imperative that these agreements are made available to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 350 Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans—I think we had the majority of the Democrats, and I think we had every Republican—wrote to Secretary Kerry last fall.

Iran’s willingness to resolve concerns over its bomb work, as we said in that letter, is a fundamental test of Iran’s intention to uphold a comprehensive agreement. That is why we all wrote that letter together, in order to make that point.

The administration once took the same position that we are taking right now on the House floor as well, but it gave that position away in negotiations. It gave away that position.

Reviewing these side agreements is critical to understanding whether Iran intends to pass that test. We need access to those agreements.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after several years of difficult negotiations with a dangerous and malevolent regime, the administration and representatives of the other P5+1 nations reached an agreement with Iran over its nuclear program.

The primary objective of the United States in the negotiations was to prevent Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon. Given the unthinkable consequences of Iran, the world’s foremost sponsor of terrorism, obtaining the bomb, this has been an overriding national security imperative of the United States for decades.

As an American and as a Jew who is deeply concerned about the security of Israel, it is also intensely personal.

I believe our vital interests have been advanced under the agreement, since it would be extremely difficult for Iran to amass enough fissionable material to make a nuclear weapon without giving the United States ample notice and time to stop it.

We will still need to guard against any Iranian effort to obtain nuclear material or technology from proliferators abroad, a reality even if Iran had given up all enrichment.

But the agreement likely gives the world at least a decade and a half without the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon and without going to war to

make that so. That is a major achievement.

The United States realized this objective by securing a number of important provisions in the agreement, including the power to snap back sanctions, in whole or in part, and not subject to a veto in the United Nations.

The United States and its allies also procured an extensive and intrusive inspections regime that lasts for 25 years or more. By applying to the whole chain of the enrichment process, from the ground to the centrifuge, it realistically precludes Iran from developing a hidden and parallel enrichment process.

With respect to those inspections, I think it is very important to clarify something which I often hear the opponents obscure, and that is there are inspections with respect to Iran's prior military work, inspections of known nuclear sites and inspections of other sites which we may suspect Iran may conduct work in the future. And the mechanisms with respect to each are different.

With respect to the known nuclear sites, there are 24/7 eyes on Iran's enrichment activities that would be the most extensive and intrusive inspections any nation has seen of its nuclear program.

□ 1430

With respect to its potential sites—that is sites we don't know, where we suspect in the future they may do work—we will have a mechanism to obtain inspections in a timely way and certainly in a timely enough way that, if they were to ever utilize radioactive material, they would be detected.

Finally, we have the inspections into their prior military work. I will say this with respect to the prior military work, those of us that have reviewed the intelligence know that we have an extensive bank of information about what Iran had been doing in the past. To the degree that we need a baseline for what Iran's work has been, we have that baseline, and I think that is a pivotal consideration going forward.

As recently as yesterday, the Director of National Intelligence stated that he has great confidence that we can determine if Iran fails to comply with the agreement.

For me, it is the size and sophistication of Iran's nuclear enrichment capability after 15 years that is the key challenge. At that point, it is the work necessary to produce the mechanism for the bomb that becomes the real obstacle to a breakout, and that work is the most challenging to detect. Nevertheless, I have searched for a better, credible alternative and concluded that there is none.

When it comes to predicting the future, we are all looking through the glass darkly, but if Congress rejects the deal agreed to by the administration and much of the world, the sanctions regime will, if not collapse, almost certainly erode.

This does not mean that Iran necessarily dashes madly for a bomb, but it will almost certainly move forward with its enrichment program, unconstrained by inspections, limits on research, and development of new centrifuges, metallurgy, or other protections in the deal.

In short, Iran will have many of the advantages of the deal in access to money and trade with none of its disadvantages. Instead of rejecting the deal, therefore, Congress should focus on making it stronger.

First, we should make it clear that, if Iran cheats, the repercussions will be severe.

Second, we should continue to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to detect any form of Iranian non-compliance.

Third, we should establish the expectation that, while Iran will be permitted to have an enrichment capability for civilian use, it will never, never be permitted to produce highly enriched uranium, and if it attempts to do so, it will be stopped with force.

Fourth, we will share with Israel all the technologies necessary to maintain its regional military superiority and, if necessary, to destroy Iran's nuclear facilities no matter how deep the bunker.

Finally, we are prepared to work with Israel and our Gulf allies to make sure that every action Iran takes to use its newfound wealth for destructive activities in the region will prompt an equal and opposite reaction, and we will combat Iran's malignant influence.

The Iranian people will one day throw off the shackles of their repressive regime, and I hope that this deal will empower those who wish to reform Iranian governance and behavior. The 15 years or more this agreement provides will give us the time to test that proposition.

Then, as now, if Iran is determined to develop the bomb, there is only one way to stop it, and that is by the use of force; but the American people and others around the world will recognize that we did everything possible to avoid war.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, although the Obama administration has pitched the Iran nuclear accord as a way to prevent the Ayatollahs from developing nuclear weapons, the agreement lifts the key restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities after 10 to 15 years. Many of my fellow Members wonder how the administration can be so naive as to pave the way for an Iranian bomb in the course of trying to prevent an Iranian bomb.

Well, the answer is clear to me. The President is gambling. He is betting that the very act of engaging with Iran

will moderate the regime's behavior so that, in a decade or so from now, we won't have to worry about it anymore. He has called his engagement with Iran a calculated risk. Indeed, it is a risk.

As I said, the President is placing a bet; but why would anyone bet on the moderation of the Iranian regime? It has not changed one iota since the Ayatollahs seized power in 1979. Thirty-six years later, Iran is the world's biggest state sponsor of terrorism. It is also responsible for the deaths of thousands of U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

Obama has spoken of the Ayatollah Khamenei as possibly seeking to rejoin the community of nations. This is a thin reed to justify giving Iran a path to the bomb in the near future. With their ritual "death to America" chants, I don't know how the Iranians could make it any more clear that they do not want to rejoin the community of nations. They want to blow up the community of nations.

Soon after the Iranian agreement was signed, Khamenei himself tweeted a silhouette image of President Obama holding a gun to his head. I just don't understand what is more clear that this regime could do to make its intentions clearer to the American people, but our President sees things differently.

As he told The New York Times, if the nuclear agreement is signed, "Who knows? Iran may change."

Well, consider this: if you are rolling the dice at a casino, who knows? You may roll a 7. If you are at the roulette wheel, who knows? It may land on your number. When you are gambling, one thing is for sure; in the long run, the casino always wins.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this is not about a casino, nor is it about a gambler losing money. This is about gambling on human lives, U.S. lives and our Western allies' lives.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, reasonable people disagree about the merits and shortcomings of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

In the strongest democracy in the world, we have a sacred duty to uphold the high standard of debate and govern responsibly. That is why I am profoundly disappointed by vitriolic personal attacks and character assassinations on both sides of this debate; and I am outraged by the Republicans' attempt to score political points on this critical issue of national and global security.

The threat to pursue wasteful litigation and to tie the hands of our President until the end of his term are particularly outrageous, when the Senate has indicated it will not even consider these measures. I strongly oppose the blatantly irresponsible partisan political measures before the House this week.

As ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have participated in dozens of classified and unclassified Iran briefings with the Obama administration, including members of our negotiating team and colleagues in Congress during the last 2 years.

I have thoroughly evaluated the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action released in July, met with foreign leaders, nuclear experts, and heard from thousands of thoughtful and passionate constituents.

After careful consideration, I will vote against approval of the agreement. Sufficient safeguards simply are not in place to address the risk associated with this agreement, and it will not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

First, in 15 years, Iran will become an internationally recognized nuclear threshold state capable of producing highly enriched uranium to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, relieving U.N. sanctions on conventional arms and ballistic missiles and releasing billions of dollars to the Iranian regime will lead to a dangerous regional weapons race and enable Iran to bolster its funding of Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis, and Bashar al-Assad.

Third, the deal does not explicitly require Iran to fully disclose its previous military work before sanctions relief is provided. Inspectors will not have anytime, anywhere access to the most suspicious facilities, particularly the Parchin military complex, with a process that lacks transparency and could delay inspectors access for up to 24 days.

Finally, there are no clear accountability measures regarding punishment for minor violations of the agreement. In recent weeks, the administration has responded to some of my concerns by committing to additional security assistance to Israel and our Gulf partners and to improving international cooperation on countering Iran's non-nuclear destabilizing activities.

I will work in Congress and with the administration to expeditiously implement these commitments to enhance—not just maintain—nonnuclear-related sanctions to establish stronger mechanisms to deter Iran and to ensure Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

One of my highest priorities will continue to be the protection of Israel's qualitative military edge so that our closest ally in the region can defend itself against all threats from Iran or its proxies.

In the same week, my colleagues, that Congress holds this important vote, Iran's Supreme Leader vowed again to annihilate the Jewish State of Israel and to vilify the Great Satan that he calls the United States of America.

It is my sincere hope that we can work together in a bipartisan way moving forward. The security of the

United States of America and our allies depends on it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and was the author of some of the Iran sanctions laws that are in force today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed chairman for his leadership on this critical issue. I also want to congratulate Mr. POMPEO, whose resolution we are discussing.

Mr. Speaker, this deal will allow Iran to become nuclear capable in just a short order. It will allow Iran to grow and expand its military. It will allow Iran to continue with its support for terror. These facts are indisputable.

What is also indisputable is that the regime in Tehran detests the United States, the West, and the democratic Jewish State of Israel, our steadfast partner. The Supreme Leader of Iran constantly incites chants of "death to America" and "death to Israel." Are we not listening?

Through its proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, Iran seeks to make this threat into a reality. Earlier this week, the Supreme Leader threatened that Israel will no longer exist in just 25 years.

Because of this agreement, Mr. Speaker, the regime will now have the weapons; it will now have the capabilities to pose an even greater threat to us, to Israel, and to our interests in the region. Giving a regime that openly calls for and works toward our destruction and the destruction of Israel is insane. We are providing Iran a path to nuclear weapons and increased conventional weapons capability.

This isn't just bad policy. It is dangerous. It is naive to think that this nuclear deal with Iran won't make us and the world less safe, less secure, and less peaceful. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must reject it.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. POMPEO for this resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated between the United States, the permanent 5 members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany, the European Union, and Iran.

I support this deal because it is the best available option to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, an outcome that all of us agree must be prevented. The opponents of this agreement say that Iran supports terrorism. I don't disagree with that.

This deal, however, is about only one issue—the issue that the entire world agrees is by far the most pressing—preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. It is precisely because Iran is so nefarious that this deal is so important.

□ 1445

As dangerous as Iran is and may remain, Iran would be far more dangerous if they acquired a nuclear weapon. This deal is the best way to prevent that unacceptable outcome.

The opponents of this agreement say that we can't trust the Iranians to abide by the agreement's strict restrictions on their nuclear program. That may be true. And I wouldn't be supporting the agreement if it required us to trust the Iranians, but it doesn't.

This deal is built around the strictest verifications ever devised. If Iran tries to dash toward a bomb, we will be more likely to catch them using the verification procedures under this deal than we would be without it.

With this deal in place, if you do catch Iran dashing toward a nuclear weapon, all options will be on the table to stop them. But military force must always be a last resort. I have not heard any of the opponents of this agreement present any realistic diplomatic alternative that would be anywhere near as likely to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and if we reject this deal, military action will become more likely.

Whenever we send Americans into harm's way, we must be able to look them and their families in the eye and honestly tell them that we have exhausted every other option. This deal is a diplomatic option we must exhaust. This deal's opponents present no other.

The late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, said: "You don't make peace with friends. You make it with unsavory enemies."

We are now faced with three choices: this deal, a drastically increased likelihood of military confrontation, or a nuclear Iran. I support this deal, and I ask my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, what was previously unacceptable, an Iranian nuclear state, is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel and other friends in the region—and is a significant risk to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable red line was no enrichment whatsoever—but under this agreement, Iran will be able to assemble an industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to sunset in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake about it, Iran's decades-long rabid hatred of Israel

shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran's Supreme Leader said to Israel, "You will not see the next 25 years," adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, inspections are anything but anytime or anywhere, the Obama administration's previous pledge to the Nation and the world. We have learned that the IAEA has entered into a secret agreement that precludes unfettered, robust inspection. That also violates the Corker law. We have not gotten that information.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is the world's leading supporter of terrorism. This agreement provides tens of billions of dollars for weapons and war-making material.

The Supreme Leader also criticized any call to end its ballistic missile program, another eleventh hour concession. The Supreme Leader called that stupid and idiotic, and that they should mass produce such weapons and means of delivery.

Countries build ICBMs, Mr. Speaker, to deliver nukes.

The administration was reluctant, but I held two hearings and the chairman held several hearings on the Americans being held hostage. Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured, or missing. Why are they not free?

President Obama continues to tell Congress and the American people that the Iran nuclear agreement is the best deal possible and advances peace. Such boasting collapses under scrutiny. What was previously unacceptable—an Iranian nuclear state—is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of what is officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel, our allies in the region—and even poses significant risks to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable redline was no enrichment whatsoever—under this agreement, Iran will not be required to dismantle its bomb-making technology and will have an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to "sunset" in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake, Iran's decades-long rabid hatred of Israel shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said to Israel: "You will not see (the) next 25 years," adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

On the inspections front, Supreme Leader Khamenei has stated that he will "never" permit inspectors to inspect Iran's military bases. Even after the agreement was signed, the Iranian Minister of Defense reportedly said that "Tehran will not allow any foreigner to discover Iran's defensive and missile capabilities by inspecting the country's military sites."

Inspections under this agreement are anything but "anytime, anywhere"—the Obama Administration's previous pledge to the nation

and the world. We have learned that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has entered into a secret side agreement to preclude unfettered, robust inspection, and in another bizarre concession by the Administration and our negotiating partners, even allows Iran to self-monitor in certain circumstances.

Yet the agreement itself contains many limits on access by IAEA inspectors to suspected sites, including a 24-day period in which Iran is allowed to continue to refuse the IAEA's request to visit a facility followed by a very long process needed to increase pressure on Iran to permit access if it still blocks access by inspectors. During this period, Iran will have sufficient time to remove, cover up, or destroy any evidence. "Managed access" would be better called "manipulated access" as inspectors will get access to suspected sites only after consultations between the world powers and Iran, over nearly a month.

Given Iran's repeated cover-ups of its clandestine nuclear program, its refusal to give the IAEA access to its Parchin military facility (where Iran is believed to have tested detonators for nuclear warheads), and its stonewalling the IAEA concerning evidence that it had done extensive research and development on a nuclear explosive device, verification is fundamental to ensure that Iran is abiding by the agreement's terms. Secretary of State John Kerry, after an Iranian history of refusal to allow inspections at Parchin, would only assure us of inspections there "as appropriate," whatever that means.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman has said that pledges by Obama Administration officials that the agreement would guarantee "anywhere, anytime" inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities were only "rhetorical." Mere words without substance? Why would our allies in the region trust us if our word—and negotiating positions—are indeed only rhetorical flourish?

The key restriction on Iran's nuclear program—the ability to enrich at high levels—begins to expire in as little as 10 years. Once these restrictions expire, Iran could enrich on an industrial scale and the U.S. and its allies will be left with no effective measures to prevent Iran from initiating an accelerated nuclear program to produce the materials needed for a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the IAEA has uncovered significant evidence that Iran has engaged in activities related to the development of a nuclear weapon. Despite many agreements with the IAEA in which Iran has pledged to provide satisfactory information, the IAEA has repeatedly said that Iran has given it virtually nothing. Secretary Kerry has said that the U.S. has "absolute knowledge" of Iran's past military activities regarding its nuclear program, but Gen. Michael Hayden, the former Director of the CIA, recently testified to Congress that the U.S. did not have that capability.

Furthermore, as witnesses testified at a joint hearing in July by three Foreign Affairs subcommittees, there is ample evidence that Iran has a longstanding nuclear collaboration with North Korea. In light of the abundant evidence they will present, what gives the Administration certainty that the Iranians won't at some point during this agreement acquire fissile material beyond what they are allowed to produce for themselves or actual warheads from North Korea?

Why was the Iran-North Korea nuclear collaboration not factored into the Iran nuclear

agreement? Surely Secretary Kerry is aware of the Iran-North Korea nuclear linkage. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Douglas Frantz, previously a high-ranking Kerry Senate aide, wrote a 2003 article about Iran's ties to the North Korean nuclear program. Are we to believe Frantz and Kerry never discussed this issue? He dodged the question at today's committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, in March 2007, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1747 which, *inter alia*, established an embargo on the export from Iran of all arms and related materials, thereby banning all states and groups from purchasing or receiving arms from Iran. The resolution also called on all states to "exercise vigilance and restraint" in their supply of any items covered by the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms to Iran.

However, reports indicate that Russia is eager to sell massive amounts of military hardware to Iran. Major General Qassem Soleimani, Iran's Revolutionary Guard leader, recently visited Russia. How will this shape other regional conflicts in which Iran is currently involved, including Iraq, Syria, and Yemen? After the conventional arms embargo is lifted in just 5 years, what limitations, if any, will there be on Iran's ability to export arms, specifically heavy weapons? Besides Russia, who else will sell weapons to Iran? China?

Moreover, the Administration and its supporters of the Iranian nuclear agreement downplay the possibility of Saudi Arabia, for example, producing a nuclear weapon as part of a Middle East arms race. However, the Saudis are building King Abdullah City for Atomic Renewable Energy to train nuclear scientists and already have greater science and mathematics capacity than Pakistan had when it developed nuclear weapons. Why couldn't and why wouldn't the Saudis join the nuclear arms race when faced with a more nuclear and conventionally armed Iran? Secretary Kerry would have us believe that the Saudis and others in the region would prefer the current agreement to an effort to achieve a more effective one and would agree not to pursue nuclear weapons even though Iran is on the path to develop or acquire its own.

Mr. Speaker, ballistic missiles are a central component of any country's nuclear weapons program as they allow for the quick, accurate delivery of nuclear weapons over long distances. While the agreement calls for Iran to abide by all U.N. Security Council resolutions—including the requirement that "Iran shall not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons," Iranian Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's criticized the call for Iran to end its ballistic missile program, characterizing it as "a stupid, idiotic expectation" and claiming "The Revolutionary Guards should definitely carry out their program and not be satisfied with the present level. They should mass produce."

In an 11th hour concession by the Obama Administration and others, the agreement "sunset" U.N. sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program after 8 years, and also requires that the European Union do the same. U.S. intelligence estimates Iran to have the largest arsenal of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Congress has received expert testimony that "no country that has not aspired to possess nuclear weapons has ever opted to sustain" a costly, long-range missile program.

Simply put, countries build ICBMs to deliver nukes.

Under this agreement, the Iranians have stated they are under no obligation to stop developing ballistic missiles. In fact, this agreement would allow them the two things they need to advance their program: money and foreign assistance.

Iran dared to insert ballistic missiles and conventional weapons into the nuclear negotiations without fear of disturbing the talks. Meanwhile, the Administration was reluctant to use its leverage during the negotiations to free the four Americans held hostage in Iran today. Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured or missing.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement requires “full implementation” by October 15 of the commitments in the “roadmap” made by Iran to the IAEA in their 2011 agreement, following which the IAEA is to provide its “final assessment on the resolution of all past and present outstanding issues.” However, there is no stated penalty if Iran continues to refuse to provide sufficient information to fully answer the IAEA’s questions, which Iran cannot do without admitting it had a secret nuclear weapons program.

Iran has repeatedly agreed to answer the IAEA’s questions regarding extensive evidence that it had a secret research and development program regarding a nuclear device, including fitting it onto a ballistic missile. All that resulted was the Iranians stonewalling the inspectors.

Is the failure to resolve the possible military dimensions as required by the IAEA a violation of the agreement? Why would Iran provide any information now when there is nothing in the agreement to compel it to do so?

Iran currently is the world’s leading supporter of terrorism, and this agreement provides funding that will drastically expand Iran’s regional destabilization efforts—from Israel to Iraq to Yemen to Lebanon and elsewhere. The Administration disputes the figure of \$150 billion to be released to Iran, but even a portion of that amount would provide significant resources to fund Iran’s terrorism in the region—threatening our allies in the region and global security.

Moreover, the Administration underestimates the revenue from both rising oil prices at some point and the tax revenues from increased commercial investment and activity.

Congress should oppose in any way possible the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, reinstate comprehensive, robust sanctions and direct the executive branch to resume the struggle to craft an enforceable accord to ensure no nuclear weapons capability for Iran—ever.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee’s Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Iran nuclear agreement.

As the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I am acutely aware of the harmful influence Iran

and its proxies have on the security situation in the greater Middle East. However, despite my clear and deep distrust of Iran, I firmly support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, given the improvement it works.

This hard-fought multilateral agreement will severely limit Iran’s nuclear ambitions, establish a verifiable and robust inspection regime, allow for the timely reinstatement of sanctions for violations of this agreement, and in no way limit U.S. military options.

I cannot argue that the agreement is perfect, and I am frustrated at its limited scope. However, in any negotiation, especially one among sovereign nations, each having their own economic and security considerations, some compromise is necessary. Critically, I believe the agreement reached accomplishes the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I concur with the sentiments of my esteemed friend and former Senator Richard Lugar, who recently wrote that congressional rejection of the Iran deal would “kill the last chance for Washington to reach a verifiable Iranian commitment not to build a nuclear weapon” and “destroy the effective coalition that brought Iran to the negotiating table.”

I believe it is vital for the duration of the agreement that the U.S. leads the international community to maintain focus on Iran’s compliance and ensure that Iran does not undermine regional stability through other pathways. To accomplish this, we must remain steadfast in our commitments to Israel and all our regional partners.

I ask all to constructively work to improve the security situation in the Middle East, rather than using all of their energy to undermine the agreement. We cannot rely on force of arms alone to bring lasting stability to any region of the world.

In conclusion, I do hope that the exhaustive multilateral negotiation that led to this agreement will serve as a template for future U.S. and international engagement on other outstanding issues that have led to instability and violence in the region.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California, for his leadership on this critical national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, this Iranian deal promises peace—peace in our time—by guaranteeing a nuclear weaponized Iran in our children’s time.

Anyone who has read the Iran Nuclear Agreement Act should support this legislation before us. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Act, known as the Corker bill, is to allow representatives of the American people—us—to read what is in the deal before we vote on the deal. The nuclear deal with Iran may be the most important international agreement in our lifetime.

The Corker bill is crystal clear when it comes to defining exactly what the President needs to provide Congress before the review period of 60 days begins. The President is obligated under the law—and let me read a portion of the law that the President signed. Here is what it says:

Congress is allowed to have the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.

The logic behind this requirement is simple and essential: Congress cannot review an agreement without having access to everything, including the fine print. We need to see all the secret side deals, Mr. Chairman.

Testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Kerry, who was making the deal for us, said that even he had not seen the secret side deals. And these secret deals are not just technical formalities. The deals I am talking about are the IAEA agreement to let Iran inspect itself at the Parchin military facility. The Parchin facility is known as the place where Iran has worked to build nuclear warheads.

There is absolutely nothing normal about allowing Iran to inspect itself. That is what this side agreement apparently does, if we ever get to see the whole thing.

I was a judge in Texas for a long time. It is like having a burglar coming to trial and saying: “Judge, I want 12 burglars on my jury.” We would never let that happen, but we will let Iran inspect itself? We want to see these secret deals.

And these revelations may be only the tip of the iceberg. What else is included in these secret deals, these side deals? Well, we really don’t know because we haven’t been furnished—by law—these deals.

It is the legal right of Congress to know all of those details before voting to approve or disapprove this nuclear agreement. We in Congress are the representatives of the people. Isn’t it about time we start reading all the information before we vote? I don’t know that Congress has learned that lesson.

The citizens of this country have a right to know absolutely about these side deals. The President signed the Corker bill. It is the law. He has to live by it, whether he likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. In 2002, the President of the United States and this Congress voted to address the perceived threat of a mushroom cloud coming from Iraq by going to war, a war that unleashed massive violence in the Middle East and threatens the world even today.

The Obama administration, faced with the actual threat of a nuclear weaponized Iran, has chosen, instead,

the path of diplomacy, the path of peace, and I am proud to support this historic agreement.

As the President said: "This deal demonstrates that American diplomacy can bring about real and meaningful change—change that makes our country, and the world, safer and more secure."

Voices inside and outside the Congress are calling for a rejection of this historic agreement, among them the same neocons who stampeded the United States into war with Iraq. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now. Iran is now 2 to 3 months from being able to produce a nuclear weapon, and yet the critics have offered no credible alternative to a deal that blocks all the paths to a nuclear weapon.

Now, we know this deal is not perfect. Iran is a bad actor. The President and all of us would have much preferred a deal that prohibits Iran from enriching any uranium forever and maintains sanctions until Iran changes its behavior and becomes a responsible member of the world community. But that deal didn't happen—because it never could have happened.

This deal greatly improves the outlook for peace by blocking all of Iran's paths to a nuclear weapon, and this is carefully spelled out in the agreement itself, often in very technical language: Iran's stockpiles of rich uranium will be reduced from enough for 10 bombs to less than 1; the number of Iran's installed centrifuges is reduced by over two-thirds; and far from trusting Iran, the deal demands the most robust, intrusive inspections regime ever in an international agreement.

We heard yesterday, many of us, from the ambassadors from five of our allies in the P5+1. These ambassadors said if the United States walks away, the deal collapses. Iran would be without any constraints to move ahead with its nuclear weapons program. All paths would be open. There would be no inspections whatsoever, no insight into Iran's activities. The ability of the United States to build meaningful international coalitions would be eroded for the foreseeable future.

I view this upcoming vote on Iran as one of the most important of my career, and, my colleagues, I would say that is true for everyone. It is one of the most important of my life. For me, the choice is clear: diplomacy over war.

Colleagues, let's remember, nothing is off the table. But why wouldn't we choose peace and give peace a chance?

□ 1500

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Part of diplomacy is making certain that you have verification, and our problem here is that the Iranians are boasting right now that the U.S. is not going to have access—or any other international inspectors are going to have access—to their military sites

where they do this work. The problem is that inspectors don't get 24 hours' notice; they get 24 days' notice, and then they go through a process in which Iran and China and Russia can block.

The former head of the CIA Michael Hayden testified in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee that we never believed that the uranium at Iran's declared facilities would ever make its way into a weapon. We always believed that that work would be done somewhere else, in secret.

So again, if you cannot get international inspectors into Parchin where they did that work, what makes you think, what makes us believe, that in the future we are going to have international inspectors, once that is the established premise, go anywhere else, go anywhere else?

As Hayden said, requiring consultations between the world powers in Iran takes inspections from the technical level and puts it at the political level, which he calls a formula for chaos, obfuscation, ambiguity, and doubt.

And we do not even know how bad the capitulation was in the site agreements, a capitulation that will undermine the ability to catch Iranian cheating. That is why we are concerned about the way this was negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of H. Res. 411.

Mr. POMPEO. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE. A great deal about what we have learned has come out of your committee, about what we have learned about this deal and what the Iranians' objectives are. So thank you for all the hard work that the Foreign Affairs Committee has done related to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things to say about the Iranian deal that this President has set up, but this bill is very narrow and very simple and very straightforward. It is aimed to establish a simple precedent, which says, if the President signs something into law, he is going to fulfill the obligation which he has made for himself.

I have listened to the debate so far today. I can tell you that we have not had any Member of this House stand up and tell you that they have read the entire agreement. I suspect that we will not. That is because there is no American who has read the entire agreement. That is right—not the President of the United States, not the Secretary of State, not Undersecretary Sherman. No Member of Congress, no member of the public, no American citizen has read this entire agreement. And yet we have got Members who say: This a great deal, and I am excited to vote for it.

I don't know how one can feel that way about an agreement that one has not read.

We have Members of Congress stand up and demand that they see the text of bills that rename post offices, and yet this is a historic agreement, and

many of my colleagues are saying they are going to vote for it without even knowing what the details are about important components of how we are going to verify whether the Iranian regime has complied with this agreement. I think that is deeply troubling.

I think, as Representatives, we have a moral obligation to understand what it is we are voting on. I think we have a constitutional duty to require that the President comply with his obligations, and I know there is a legal obligation for the President to turn over every element of this deal.

Mr. Speaker, in July, Senator COTTON and I traveled to Vienna, where we were informed by the Deputy Director of the IAEA of these two secret side deals. He looked us straight in the eye and said he had read them but I wasn't going to get to.

I think that is wrong. I think that makes it impossible for a Member of Congress to support this agreement.

He informed me—that is, the Deputy Director of the IAEA informed me—that Iranians had read these two secret side deals, but Senator COTTON and I weren't going to get to read them.

I have spent the intervening 50 days asking, cajoling, demanding, praying that this President would do what he is required to do under Corker-Cardin and what every Member of Congress is entitled to have—that is, provide us with the deal. Well, we don't have that.

H. Res. 411 simply says we, as Members of Congress, are going to demand that this President comply with what Corker-Cardin sets out. Show us the terms of the deal. Allow us the opportunity to read the agreement so that we can form judgments and the American people can form judgments about its scope.

In the absence of that, H. Res. 411 makes clear that the President can't lift sanctions. That was the deal. In exchange for not demanding that this be a treaty, Corker-Cardin said what we want is simple transparency; just show us the simple terms of the deal. And this President couldn't do it.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 411 and demand that the President show us the secret side deals.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of America and the international community in our negotiations with Iran is and has been to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons. By all accounts, Iran had already reached a point where it was perhaps just months away from crossing that nuclear threshold—I repeat, months away; not years, not decades—months away.

So few votes can be taken more seriously than one intended to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. That is why

this Congress and the American people should support the agreement negotiated to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons, and we should vote here in this Congress against any of these congressional measures attempting to thwart its implementation.

The negotiated agreement provides for inspection and verification, a regime which Iran had to consent to and it must now submit to. That regime for inspection and verification is not just credible, it is enforceable, and those who have conducted nuclear inspections will tell you that. Ask those who deal with nuclear materials, and they will tell you that. And ask those who have butted heads with and had to negotiate with Iran, and they will tell you that.

Our ability to respond as well, should Iran decide to regress from its obligations, is real and it is robust. Nothing in this negotiated agreement is based on trust. The inspections, the penalties, they all are mandatory and unambiguous in their terms.

No deal is perfect. We can all think of ways of making a deal better. But thinking is not doing, and speculation won't stop Iran from reaching a nuclear weapons capability.

It should escape no one's notice that every measure, every economic sanction in place today against Iran has failed to stop Iran's lurch towards a nuclear weapon—remember, perhaps only months away from that nuclear threshold.

It was time for America and our international partners to take this to another level before the only alternative available to all of us was the use of military force. This is why the U.S., Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, and China joined together to force and drive Iran to the negotiated agreement.

How often, these days, can we utter the names of those six countries together working for the same cause?

This agreement constitutes a meaningful and enforceable check on Iran's nuclear ambitions and any intentions it might have to cheat.

Back in July when this agreement was reached, I stated that it "must constitute measurable progress in halting nuclear proliferation, driving the region and the world further away from nuclear Armageddon."

The negotiated agreement meets that test, and with the support of Great Britain, Germany, France, yes, even Russia, and, yes, even China, we will hold Iran to that test. And that is why we should support the negotiated agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in firm opposition to the Iran nuclear deal. This deal represents a direct threat to the United States, Israel, and the world.

Recently, I visited Israel and met with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Prime

Minister Netanyahu was firm in his warning—this is a very bad deal, and it could result in grave consequences for the world.

First, this deal allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium that can be used to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, this deal abandons the President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections to a process that allows Iran to delay up to 24 days.

Third, this agreement would result in the comprehensive lifting of the economic sanctions that have stifled Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon.

Bottom line, this deal presents far too many risks for the U.S. and far too many rewards for Iran. When the Ayatollah chants "death to America," he means it, and that should cause serious concern in every American citizen.

It is time for America to wake up and understand the danger and threat this deal presents to our national security.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First, I want to address briefly the very strained interpretation I think my friends are giving the Corker legislation. To accept the arguments of the opposition to the deal, you would have to accept the proposition that the Corker legislation requires the administration to provide an agreement between the IAEA and Iran to which the United States is not a party, to which the United States has no obligation, and of which the IAEA is precluded from providing to the administration. That seems to me a very farfetched interpretation of the Corker legislation.

What's more, if you accept the argument that we can't have a vote on the agreement until we have this document between the IAEA and Iran, then why has the majority scheduled a vote on the agreement for tomorrow? So it is inconsistent with what their own majority has scheduled.

But finally, I don't think anyone is fooled by the nature of this procedural motion or bill. No one expects, in the least, that anyone who has voiced their opposition to the agreement is somehow going to change their opinion if they have access to this private document between the IAEA and Iran. What's more, as we know, the IAEA enters into these agreements with individual nations around the world, so this is not at all unique to the situation with Iran.

One final point I would like to make: We are now well into the debate on the agreement, and for all the arguments that have been advanced as to why we should have concerns about provisions in the agreement or concerns about Iranian behavior, many of which I share, there is one thing we have heard precious little about from the opposition to the deal, and that is, what is the credible alternative?

So, I ask the question: What is the credible alternative?

And the answer, from what I am able to divine from the scarce attention that the opposition pays to this—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself an additional minute.

The answer, as far as I can discern from the opposition to the deal, is this: This is how the alternative would work.

Congress rejects the deal. Congress, the administration, then, somehow goes out and persuades the rest of the world to maintain sanctions, even when we rejected an agreement adopted by the other major powers, and even when those other powers tell us explicitly that there will be no new negotiations. But somehow we maintain the sanctions regime under this theoretical alternative.

And what? Iran gives up all enrichment and comes back to the table prepared to capitulate everything?

That seems so fanciful, so far removed from the reality of the situation, that it is no surprise that the opposition devotes very little, if any, time to discussing a credible alternative, because, indeed, there is no credible alternative.

So, again, this is why I think it is so important for us to focus on how we can strengthen the constraints in the agreement, mitigate the risks that we will face, and that is a much more constructive path forward than rejection of this, seeing Iran going back to spinning up its centrifuges, picking up where they left off at 20 percent enrichment and going beyond, picking up where they left off with 19,000 more centrifuges and thousands of kilos of uranium.

Is that really the path we want to go down? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

There was a credible alternative. There was a credible alternative that this body passed by a vote of 400–20, bipartisan legislation which the administration blocked in the Senate, legislation which would have put that additional pressure on the regime in Iran.

Knowing that the United States is the 800-pound gorilla, knowing that countries do not have the option and companies around the world do not have the option of making a choice when they have to make that choice between doing business with the United States or doing business with Iran, they have to do business with the United States.

We have put that bill into the Senate. The administration blocked it. That legislation would have ensured the type of pressure on Iran that would have forced the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his plan to construct a weapon or economic collapse for that regime.

We would have had that leverage in this negotiation. That leverage was

given up by this administration by blocking that bill in the Senate in the last Congress. And, frankly, that option is still available to us.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is September 11, a solemn day in our history when thousands of Americans lost their lives in the worst terror attack in our history.

It is disturbing that we happen to be debating whether a state sponsor of terror should have a glide path to nuclear weapons at this time. But we are.

I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a long time, almost 20 years now. I chaired the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

I can tell you without any reservation that this deal with Iran is a disaster. It will weaken the security of our allies in the region, and it will make Americans less safe here at home.

If this deal goes through, Iran will receive up to \$150 billion. That is 25 times what Iran currently spends on its entire military. Does that seem like a good idea?

We are talking about the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism here. This money will fund more and more terror across the globe and here.

My district is the greater Cincinnati area. GE aircraft engines is headquartered there. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is just up the road. They have been top potential targets for ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, since the cold war.

This deal allows Iran to get more sophisticated ICBM technology from Russia, which will allow them to target not only Tel Aviv, but Washington and New York and Cincinnati. This is just nuts.

What happened to the "anytime, anywhere" inspections? Gone. It will take months to get the inspectors in. And, by that time, they will have moved the incriminating evidence elsewhere.

The bottom line is the Obama administration wanted a deal, any deal, more than the Iranian mullahs did. This administration was willing to sell out Israel and our allies in the region and make us less safe here at home.

This is a lousy, lousy deal, and it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to take a brief moment to respond to my colleague from California.

I wish it were so simple that a credible alternative was the passage of a bill in Congress that had not passed before that we could pass now and, through the mere act of our legislation, compel the rest of the world to join us in a new negotiation and a stronger round of sanctions. We simply don't have that power to coerce the rest of the world with a bill we pass here in Congress.

What is more, to imagine that a new sanctions bill will somehow force Iran to come back to the table ready to concede its entire enrichment program is simply not credible. If that is what we are left with, we are really left with no really good alternative.

Again, I think that is precisely why we need to move forward with the agreement that has been reached between the world powers and Iran.

At this point, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is fundamental to the national security of the United States.

I applaud the tremendous efforts of Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz, who worked in concert with the world's most powerful military and economic nations to reach a verifiable agreement that will deny the ability of Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

In a past era, when politics was civil and foreign policy was bipartisan, this diplomatic agreement would have been championed by Republicans and Democrats as a nonproliferation triumph, as it is today in Great Britain, our greatest ally. This agreement will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

As an Israeli intelligence analyst has said, "This is not about trust and goodwill between sides. It is the strict inspection and verification regimes that will ensure the success of the agreement."

And if Iran violates the agreement, sanctions will "snap back" and the international community together will take action.

I strongly support this agreement, and I am grateful for President Obama's unwavering leadership in the face of hostile and unprecedented attacks from Republicans and Israel's Prime Minister.

The New York Times calls the Republican efforts a "vicious battle against Mr. Obama" and an "unseemly spectacle of lawmakers siding with a foreign leader against their own Commander in Chief."

I want to be crystal clear: I support our Commander in Chief.

The Republicans and Israeli opponents of this agreement are the same neocons who sold the war in Iraq to America based on lies, distortions, and misinformation.

And now what do the Republicans offer as an alternative? Nothing. They have no plan, no plan other than to kill this agreement, which means that Iran will either obtain a nuclear weapon or the U.S. goes to war to stop them. Well, let me tell you: I am not interested in another Republican war in the Middle East.

Now is the time to put the national security of the American people first. Let's reject this Republican game playing and support a tough diplomatic agreement that will stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice strong opposition to this fatally flawed Iran deal.

By signing the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, the President agreed to allow all documents, secret annexes, and side deals to be reviewed by the U.S. Congress.

But, once again, President Obama has not complied with the law of the land and, therefore, does not have the authority to waive sanctions on Iran.

By lifting sanctions on the Iranian regime, a nation that finances the likes of Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups will receive over \$100 billion in assets and no doubt will continue to fund terrorist organizations at probably greater levels than they are able to do today, those terrorist organizations with the motto "death to America."

Have we learned nothing from our past mistakes? The same person that negotiated the deal with North Korea also led the discussions with Iran.

We must ask ourselves, Is the world a safer place when unstable nations like North Korea are testing nuclear weapons?

The number one responsibility of the United States Congress charged to us in the Constitution is national security.

This agreement jeopardizes our security because I believe, as the Prime Minister of Israel believes, that this will ensure that Iran will get a nuclear weapon.

For the security of America and our friends and allies around the world, we must oppose this agreement.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for his extraordinary leadership as the ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, which has served us so well.

His leadership has served us so well in this debate today and in our deliberations leading up to this debate. It has served us well in the ongoing as we use intelligence to protect the American people. So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

I did not go to the well as usual for the leader, but I wanted to be here because I have some materials that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think today and tomorrow, the next 24 hours, is a very, very special time in the Congress of the United States. Members will be called upon to make a decision that affects our oath of office, to protect and support the Constitution and, of course, the American people.

This is a moment that we are prepared for. That is what I have this

binder here for, to say I commend my colleagues because they have spent thousands of hours reviewing the agreement, reviewing the annexes and the classified materials, speaking with experts, gaining information, acquiring validation from outside sources other than the administration and the agreement itself, conversations with each other, conversations with their constituents, all to have, again, a sense of humility that we all don't know everything about this subject.

And we have to get our assurances from those whose judgment we respect, as well as to support this agreement on the merits. It is a very fine agreement.

I will take a moment just to talk about my own credentials because I see that people are doing that in their statements. I read with interest Senator MENENDEZ' statement where he talks about his service in the Senate, and I will talk about mine in the House.

For over 20 years, I have served as a member of the Intelligence Committee both as a member of the committee, as the top Democrat on the committee, and as the Speaker and leader ex officio over the years, longer than anyone in the history of the Congress.

I went to the Intelligence Committee because I had a major concern which sprang from my district, which was a very big interest there in stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Plowshares, an organization dedicated to that purpose, was founded there. They saluted President Reagan and the actions that he took when he was President. And they are very actively supporting this agreement now.

But I mentioned my credentials because I brought that experience to make a judgment on the agreement after it was negotiated.

Of course we were briefed, as members of the committee and members of the leadership, on the ongoing as to the progress that was being made in negotiations.

Again, having been briefed all along the way, I still was pleasantly pleased to see what the final product was. What the President negotiated was remarkable. It was remarkable in several respects.

One was that the P5, the permanent members of the Security Council, plus one—that would be Germany—the P5 nations negotiated this agreement with Iran: China, Russia, France, the U.K., the United States.

This is quite remarkable, that all of those countries could come to agreement. And an important part of that leadership was the leadership of President Obama to have that engagement sustained over a couple-year period.

Now, President Bush took us a bit down this path, and that is referenced in an op-ed that was put forth by Brent Scowcroft.

When he supported this legislation, he says that "The deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer."

But he talks about the fact that this has been a goal, as what Ronald Reagan did with the Soviet Union arms control and what President Nixon did with China. It was a negotiation.

And he talked about the fact that this particular agreement was one that was worked on under the presidency of President Bush. Actually, he places it in time.

So let me read his comment:

"Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media.

"In my view, the JCPOA"—as it is known—"meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council."

He goes on for a couple of pages.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD Brent Scowcroft's statement.

[From the Washington Post, August 23, 2015]

THE IRAN DEAL: AN EPOCHAL MOMENT THAT CONGRESS SHOULDN'T SQUANDER

(By Brent Scowcroft)

Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. (Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media)

In my view, the JCPOA meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council. Iran has committed to never developing or acquiring a nuclear weapon; the deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer, unless Iran repudiates the inspection regime and its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Additional Protocol.

There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who led the technical negotiating team. When he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to the fissile material necessary to make a nuclear weapon, responsible people listen. Twenty-nine eminent U.S. nuclear scientists have endorsed Moniz's assertions.

If the United States could have handed Iran a "take it or leave it" agreement, the terms doubtless would have been more onerous on Iran. But negotiated agreements, the

only ones that get signed in times of peace, are compromises by definition. It is what President Reagan did with the Soviet Union on arms control; it is what President Nixon did with China.

And as was the case with specific agreements with the Soviet Union and China, we will continue to have significant differences with Iran on important issues, including human rights, support for terrorist groups and meddling in the internal affairs of neighbors. We must never tire of working to persuade Iran to change its behavior on these issues, and countering it where necessary. And while I believe the JCPOA, if implemented scrupulously by Iran, will help engage Tehran constructively on regional issues, we must always remember that its sole purpose is to halt the country's nuclear weapons activities.

Israel's security, an abiding U.S. concern, will be enhanced by the full implementation of the nuclear deal. Iran is fully implementing the interim agreement that has placed strict limits on its nuclear program since January 2014 while the final agreement was being negotiated. If Iran demonstrates the same resolve under the JCPOA, the world will be a much safer place. And if it does not, we will know in time to react appropriately.

Let us not forget that Israel is the only country in the Middle East with overwhelming retaliatory capability. I have no doubt that Iran's leaders are well aware of Israel's military capabilities. Similarly, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) members have impressive conventional militaries, and the United States is committed to enhancing their capabilities.

Congress rightfully is conducting a full review and hearing from proponents and opponents of the nuclear deal. However, the seeming effort to make the JCPOA the ultimate test of Congress's commitment to Israel is probably unprecedented in the annals of relations between two vibrant democracies. Let us be clear: There is no credible alternative were Congress to prevent U.S. participation in the nuclear deal. If we walk away, we walk away alone. The world's leading powers worked together effectively because of U.S. leadership. To turn our back on this accomplishment would be an abdication of the United States' unique role and responsibility, incurring justified dismay among our allies and friends. We would lose all leverage over Iran's nuclear activities. The international sanctions regime would dissolve. And no member of Congress should be under the illusion that another U.S. invasion of the Middle East would be helpful.

So I urge strongly that Congress support this agreement. But there is more that Congress should do. Implementation and verification will be the key to success, and Congress has an important role. It should ensure that the International Atomic Energy Agency, other relevant bodies and U.S. intelligence agencies have all the resources necessary to facilitate inspection and monitor compliance. Congress should ensure that military assistance, ballistic missile defense and training commitments that the United States made to GCC leaders at Camp David in May are fully funded and implemented without delay. And it should ensure that the United States works closely with the GCC and other allies to moderate Iranian behavior in the region, countering it where necessary.

My generation is on the sidelines of policymaking now; this is a natural development. But decades of experience strongly suggest that there are epochal moments that should not be squandered. President Nixon realized it with China. Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush realized it with the Soviet Union. And I believe we face it with Iran today.

□ 1530

Ms. PELOSI. I also want to quote another Republican—Brent Scowcroft served in the administration of President George Herbert Walker Bush—Senator John Warner joined Senator Carl Levin. These are two chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee—one a Democrat, but before him, a Republican, John Warner. They talk about they support this. They say:

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Carl Levin and John Warner's statement for the RECORD.

WHY HAWKS SHOULD ALSO BACK THE IRAN DEAL

(By Carl Levin and John Warner)

We both were elected to the Senate in 1978 and privileged to have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee for 30 years, during which we each held committee leadership positions of chairman or ranking minority member. We support the Iran Agreement negotiated by the United States and other leading world powers for many reasons, including its limitations on Iran's nuclear activities, its strong inspections regime, and the ability to quickly re-impose sanctions should Iran violate its provisions.

But we also see a compelling reason to support the agreement that has gotten little attention: Rejecting it would weaken the deterrent value of America's military option.

As former chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have always believed that the U.S. should keep a strong military option on the table. If Iran pursues a nuclear weapon, some believe that military action is inevitable if we're to prevent it from reaching its goal. We don't subscribe to that notion, but we are skeptical that, should Iran attempt to consider moving to a nuclear weapon, we could deter them from pursuing it through economic sanctions alone.

How does rejecting the agreement give America a weaker military hand to play? Let's imagine a world in which the United States rejects the nuclear accord that all other parties have embraced. The sanctions now in place would likely not be maintained and enforced by all the parties to the agreement, so those would lose their strong deterrent value. Iran would effectively argue to the world that it had been willing to negotiate an agreement, only to have that agreement rejected by a recalcitrant America.

In that world, should we find credible evidence that Iran is starting to move toward a nuclear weapon, the United States would almost certainly consider use of the military option to stop that program. But it's highly unlikely that our traditional European allies, let alone China and Russia, would support the use of the military option since we had undermined the diplomatic path. Iran surely would know this, and so from the start, would have less fear of a military option than if it faced a unified coalition.

While the United States would certainly provide the greatest combat power in any military action, allies and other partners make valuable contributions—not just in direct participation, but also in access rights,

logistics, intelligence, and other critical support. If we reject the agreement, we risk isolating ourselves and damaging our ability to assemble the strongest possible coalition to stop Iran.

In short, then, rejecting the Iran deal would erode the current deterrent value of the military option, making it more likely Iran might choose to pursue a nuclear weapon, and would then make it more costly for the U.S. to mount any subsequent military operation. It would tie the hands of any future president trying to build international participation and support for military force against Iran should that be necessary.

Those who think the use of force against Iran is almost inevitable should want the military option to be as credible and effective as possible, both as a deterrent to Iran's nuclear ambitions and in destroying Iran's nuclear weapons program should that become necessary. For that to be the case, the United States needs to be a party to the agreement rather than being the cause of its collapse.

In our many years on the Armed Services Committee, we saw time and again how America is stronger when we fight alongside allies. Iran must constantly be kept aware that a collective framework of deterrence stands resolute, and that if credible evidence evolves that Iran is taking steps towards a nuclear arsenal, it would face the real possibility of military action by a unified coalition of nations to stop their efforts.

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Ms. PELOSI. Again, I refer to the statements of my colleagues. They are thoughtful; they are serious, and they are courageous in support of the agreement.

I would like to thank President Obama and the entire administration for being available as Members sought clarification to respond to their concerns. I want to thank the President, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and so many others for their leadership and availability to us in a bipartisan way in our Democratic Caucus.

For years, Iran's rapidly accelerating enrichment capability and burgeoning nuclear stockpile has represented one of the greatest threats to peace and security anywhere in the world. We all stipulate to that. That is why we need an agreement.

That is why I am so pleased that we have so many statements of validation from people. The experts say:

This agreement is one of the greatest diplomatic achievements of the 21st century.

It is no wonder that such a diverse and extraordinary constellation of experts have made their voices heard in support of this—again, I use the word—“extraordinary” accord.

On the steps of the Capitol the other day with our veterans and with our Gold Star moms who have lost their sons, we heard the words of diplomats and soldiers, generals and admirals and diplomats by the score—Democrats, Republicans, and nonpartisan.

We heard from our most distinguished nuclear physicists; we heard from those scientists, and we heard from people of faith. I would like to quote some of them. More than 100 Democratic and Republican former diplomats and ambassadors wrote:

In our judgment, the JCPOA deserves congressional support and the opportunity to show that it can work. We firmly believe that the most effective way to protect U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more risky alternatives.

That is the diplomats.

The generals and admirals wrote:

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence, and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

Twenty-nine of our Nation's most prominent nuclear scientists and engineers wrote:

We consider that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action the United States and its partners negotiated with Iran will advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.

I quote “and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.”

This is an innovative agreement, with much more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated nonproliferation framework.

They went on to say more.

Mr. Speaker, 440 rabbis urged Congress to endorse the statement, writing:

The Obama administration has successfully brought together the major international powers to confront Iran over its nuclear ambitions. The broad international sanctions move Iran to enter this historic agreement.

They urge support.

Mr. Speaker, 4,100 Catholic nuns wrote to Congress stating:

As women of faith, followers of the one who said, “Blessed are the peacemakers,” we urge that you risk on the side of peace and vote to approve the Iran nuclear deal.

Treasury Secretary Jack Lew warned of the hazards of rejecting the agreement, reminding us that foreign governments will not continue to make costly sacrifices at our demand. I say this in response to something that my distinguished colleague from California said:

Indeed, they would be more likely to blame us for walking away from a credible solution to one of the world's greatest security threats and would continue to reengage with Iran.

He went on to say:

Instead of toughening the sanctions, the decision by Congress to unilaterally reject the deal will end a decade of isolation of Iran and put the United States at odds with the rest of the world.

We certainly don't want to do that.

Today, something very interesting happened, Mr. Speaker. It was a statement put forth by U.K. Prime Minister

David Cameron, French President Francois Hollande, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. They wrote an op-ed for the Washington Post and said:

This is an important moment. It is a crucial opportunity at a time of heightened global uncertainty to show what diplomacy can achieve.

This is not an agreement based on trust or any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting.

They went on to say:

We condemn in no uncertain terms that Iran does not recognize the existence of the State of Israel and the unacceptable language that Iran's leaders use about Israel. Israel's security matters are and will remain our key interests, too. We would not have reached the nuclear deal with Iran if we did not think that it removed a threat to the region and the nonproliferation regime as a whole.

We are confident that the agreement provides the foundation for resolving a conflict on Iran's nuclear program permanently. This is why we now want to embark on the full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, once all national procedures are complete.

Our own President wrote to Congressman JERRY NADLER:

I believe that JCPOA, which cuts off every pathway Iran could have to a nuclear weapon and creates the most robust verification regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program, is a very good deal for the United States, for the State of Israel, and for the region as a whole.

Many of us share the views that had been expressed by those in a position to make a difference on this agreement.

Tuesday night, again after the votes here in this House, dozens of Members supporting the nuclear agreement stood on the steps of the Capitol. We were honored to be joined by military veterans and Gold Star families, men and women whose sacrifices remind us of the significance of putting diplomacy before war. They remind us of the significance of this historic transformatonal achievement.

Congratulations. These nuclear physicists, they congratulated the President on this agreement. I congratulate him, too.

Our men and women in uniform and our veterans and our Gold Star moms remind us of our first duty, to protect and defend the American people. I am pleased to say we achieve that with this agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and to vote "no" on the other items that are being put before us today.

I think we all have to, as we evaluate our decision, ask ourselves: If we were the one deciding vote as to whether this agreement would go forward or that we would fall behind, how would we vote? None of us has the luxury to walk away from that responsibility.

I am proud of the statements that our colleagues have made, the agreement the President has reached; and I

know that tomorrow we will sustain whatever veto the President may have to make.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the deputy chief whip and a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important matter of national security.

Today, I rise in opposition to this bad nuclear deal the President has negotiated. I don't oppose it because the President negotiated it. I don't oppose it because it was brought forth by this administration.

I oppose it because it is bad for the security of America. It is bad for the security of the world. It is bad for the security of our most sacred ally, Israel. It is bad for the nonproliferation strategies the world has had to mean that we have fewer nuclear weapons on this planet.

Now, you have to ask yourself a few basic questions: Has Iran warranted the trust of the international community to enter into this agreement? The answer is no. It is very clear by their actions over the last 20 and 30 years that they should not be trusted.

Number two, we hear the Supreme Leader of Iran saying, time and again, "death to America and Israel." He has declared his nation is committed to the destruction of Israel. He has called America the Great Satan.

Now, how can we believe a country is fully committed to our destruction yet, at the same time, uphold their end of the bargain? We can't. We must oppose this agreement based off of what is best for international security and what is best for our Nation's security.

We also have to oppose this because it will mean, during my lifetime or during my children's lifetime, we will have more nuclear weapons, not fewer.

This is a bad agreement, and we should reject it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and the ability to control the time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since 1998, I have had the privilege of sending a group of high school students each year to Israel where they are paired with Israeli teens to learn about what life is really like in Israel.

When these students return, they have learned life lessons that stay with them forever, but just as important, they have made friendships that will also last a lifetime.

I am a proud and strong friend and ally of Israel, and I have been for a very long time. This is why I believe we must support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and why I am here

to oppose the resolution. The world cannot tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran, and I will not stand by as Iran continues to gain ground towards that objective.

This agreement puts real, concrete steps in place to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, steps that have already begun to degrade Iran's ability to produce nuclear material.

According to the independent experts, this deal "effectively blocks the plutonium pathway for more than 15 years." These experts also assess that, without the deal, Iran may shrink its breakout time to a few weeks or even days.

The steps outlined in the agreement complement existing prohibitions on the development of a nuclear weapon by Iran.

□ 1545

Under this agreement, the international community will have unprecedented access to ensure that Iran never gets one.

This agreement will not be monitored merely according to the goodwill of Iran. Its enforcement mechanisms are verifiable and transparent.

Under this agreement, there will be more inspectors than ever in Iran. These inspectors will have daily access to Iran's declared nuclear sites and will be able to have access to undeclared sites that they suspect may be involved in nuclear activity. Inspections will be regular, and they will be invasive. They will not be oriented around Iranian convenience but, rather, around compliance, ensuring that the international community remains safe and, indeed, informed.

If at any time Iran is found to be in violation of the agreement, the full brunt of international sanctions will snap back, once again hobbling the Iranian economy.

It is important to note that many sanctions will still be in place. Relief will come only from those sanctions related to nuclear activities. Bans on technology exports, restrictions against the transfer of conventional weaponry and WMD technology, sanctions based on terrorism activities, and bans on foreign assistance will all continue.

Without this deal, experts estimate that Iran will have enough nuclear material for weapons in 2 or 3 months. During negotiations, Iran stopped installing centrifuges, but they will resume if this agreement falls apart, potentially accelerating that timeline.

The opponents of this agreement propose rejecting this deal and pursuing a stronger one, but that plan could have grave consequences. If the United States rejects this deal, Iran will continue developing more sophisticated enrichment technologies. By the time any new negotiations begin, Iran would likely already be a nuclear state. There is also no guarantee that Iran would return to the negotiating table after having wasted 2 years on this agreement.

Is this worth the risk? I do not believe that it is. We should support this agreement.

This agreement accomplishes a critical goal: establishing a set of verifiable provisions to prevent Iran from developing enough nuclear material to build a bomb.

This deal does not change, in any way, our solemn commitment to protecting Israel, nor does this prevent us from using any other measures if Iran should violate this agreement, including using the full force of the strongest military in the world.

But the United States must lead not only with our military might; we have worked diligently to achieve a peaceful resolution to this issue, and it is time for us to show our integrity and values for which we stand.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a true American hero who served this country with distinction in Korea and in Vietnam and as a prisoner of war for nearly 7 years.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at this grave hour, I come to express my opposition to President Obama's deal with Iran.

To this day, Iran chants "death to America." In fact, Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Its regime has the blood of America's servicemembers on its hands.

Iran is our enemy.

The President asks us to trust Iran; but what has Iran done to earn our trust? Nothing. This is a deal of surrender, and, with it, Iran will go nuclear.

The alternative isn't war. The alternative is to strike a better deal. I say this as one of the few Members of Congress who has seen combat, who has fought two wars, and who has spent nearly 7 years as a POW.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do the right thing. Put country above party. Listen to the American people. Uphold your most sacred duty—safeguard our Republic from those who seek to destroy it. Vote this deal down.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend for yielding to me on this important subject for our country today and in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, while many Republicans have been trying to find a way, just this very day, not to have a vote on the Iran agreement, I have been searching for a way to represent my 650,000 constituents by voting on any version offered. Five nations, whose systems differ from one another in every conceivable way, and the United Nations have approved this deal, but the Republicans are torn on whether to even vote on the deal at all.

No wonder.

Left with no credible argument against the deal, itself, Republicans have changed the subject, even knowing that Iran is close to getting the bomb as I speak and risking the loss of U.S. international credibility. Instead, Republicans cite side agreements. However, they have all of the information available to any nation on all nuclear agreements, or they cite issues not under negotiation at all, like Iran's role in the Middle East.

Here is what my constituents cite, Mr. Speaker:

\$12,000 in Federal taxes per resident—the most per capita in the United States—but no vote on the Iran deal or on anything else on this House floor. With statehood, D.C. would vote "yes" and be counted just as Uncle Sam counts our taxes every single year.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for yielding this time. I thank him for his strong leadership to reject this administration's agreement with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, this deal is a dramatic reversal of U.S. policy in the Middle East and towards the Iranian Government. For years, the Iranian Government has actively opposed U.S. interests in the region and has directly financed some of the world's most oppressive terrorist groups, most notably, Hezbollah.

As a result of this agreement, over \$100 billion will be released from repatriated oil profits back to the mullahs in Iran, and 46 banks in Iran will now be approved to transmit money through the international financial system. Look at what they have done previously with their finances. We gave them \$700 million a month as a precondition just to come to the negotiations—\$12 billion over a 16-month period. You can see their footprint in Lebanon; you can see it in Iraq; you can see it in Yemen; you can see it in Syria; you can see it in South America.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is going to translate into increased, enhanced terrorist activities throughout the world. May we look back on this day as one of the most consequential votes we will take tomorrow in this Chamber, as consequential as what we did in declaring war against Japan and Germany. May we recognize the reality of what is taking place.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak as a freshman Member of this body who has been able to learn a great deal about this difficult, difficult area of the world—a place where America has invested too many lives and too much

money—and to talk about my journey in coming to the decision to vote with the President and feeling like he deserves a congratulatory note for this accomplishment in a very difficult and complex piece of diplomacy, perhaps equal to the difficulty and the complexity of this area of the world which has had so much turmoil and history.

I have spent the last 60 days taking every opportunity to listen to constituents and experts.

I, with a small group of my freshman colleagues, have been personally briefed at the White House by President Obama. I traveled to Israel for the first time and met with high-level Israeli officials for almost 2 hours, including with Prime Minister Netanyahu. I learned about the 3,000 years of history and animosity amongst groups and also of the very close proximity in which those groups have lived for thousands of years and shared their difficult history. I met with leaders of our international coalition, and I continue to be a staunch supporter of the U.S.-Israeli relationship as, I believe, most of my colleagues on both sides are.

I held six townhalls—a certain measure of masochism, perhaps, by a freshman Member—that took hours, meeting with both pro and opponents in my district, in the San Francisco Bay Area. We received over 1,000 phone calls, emails, and constituent questions on this issue, and more than 70 percent of them were in favor of the proposal.

Ultimately, at the heart of my decision in supporting a deal is the possibility that this deal promotes the long-term investment in peace on this difficult part of our planet. In addition, it creates security and stability, ultimately, for the United States. I believe that this accord is our best option for achieving both of those goals.

As recently as yesterday, I was able to listen to advisers and leaders who represent our coalition partners. The sanctions regime, due in large part to the European Union's participation, deflated Iran's economy and forced them to the negotiating table. In 2012, Iran's economy shrank for the first time in two decades by almost 2 percent.

This is the final proposal, I believe, if the U.S. were to withdraw. Our coalition partners that helped negotiate this deal and create the ability and the leverage to negotiate will not come back to the table. Our authority and standing in the world community will be severely diminished.

There are some who say that Iran cannot be trusted, and I think we all agree on that. The future of this rollout is not black-and-white, and it has many unknowns and hypotheticals on both the supporters' and the opponents' sides. We do not know if Iran will cheat, but we do know that oversight and compliance is strong and consequential, and consequences for cheating will be enforced by the international community.

In my view, it is in the national security interests of the United States of

America to support this agreement. It is an opportunity to let diplomacy work and to put it in action.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disapproval of President Obama's deal with Iran.

I ask myself this question: Has Iran earned the right to be trusted?

We must ask this because we know there are secret deals that my colleagues and I were not privileged to. Therefore, a vote to support this deal is a vote to trust Iran.

The behavior of Iran's leaders over the last 30 years offers no indication that the next decade will be any different; and now, with these secret details, we cannot know if the deal is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

The people who know Iran best trust them the least. Iran's neighbors have already requested additional arms from the United States to protect themselves from this very deal. Any deal should include these three powerful principles: safety, security, stability. This deal falls short, and I cannot support it.

□ 1600

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this has probably been one of the most difficult decisions I have had to make during my time in Congress. For the record, I still have deep reservations about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

However, while it is not without flaws or risks, I believe the plan presents our best chance to limit Iran's nuclear ambitions and protect the security of the United States and our allies, particularly the State of Israel.

The preamble to the agreement is both critically important and crystal clear when it states that "Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons." And we will hold Iran to it in perpetuity, as they have committed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trust Iran. But this agreement is built on verification, not trust, and I believe that it includes the needed monitoring and enforcement tools.

If Iran violates the deal in any way, increased international monitoring will allow us to know quickly and act decisively. Conversely, if we were to abandon this agreement despite the international community's support, Iran's nuclear ambitions could go unchecked, and that is not a risk I am willing to take.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my constituents, I still have significant con-

cerns with the agreement and with Iran's pattern of behavior, particularly its support of terrorism.

That is why I am committed to exercising rigorous oversight of this plan's implementation, leaving no doubt that cheating will result in severe repercussions.

As the President has said publicly and he has reiterated to me personally, all of our options remain on the table when it comes to responding to failed Iranian commitments, including military options and the reimposition of sanctions, either in whole or in part, either unilaterally or multilaterally.

Additionally, all the terrorism-related sanctions are outside the scope of this agreement and remain in force, and I am committed to providing any further tools necessary to constrain Iran's destructive nonnuclear activities.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should also establish an oversight commission or Select Committee to ensure Iranian adherence to the deal and recommend courses of action in response to any breach of Iranian commitments.

This would be in addition to the Oversight Committee related to Intelligence or the Foreign Affairs Committee or other committees, including the Armed Services Committee that might also have jurisdiction.

The more eyes on Iran in this agreement in making sure that they are living up to the commitments, the better.

Mr. Speaker, we need to show our resolve and ability to execute the fundamental objectives of the JCPOA, preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

While I have deep concerns about aspects of the deal, rejecting it now would potentially lead us down an even darker path without the support of the international community and with severe and unpredictable consequences.

I will vote to support this deal and what I believe is now our best chance to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear threat, our best chance for an international community united in support of our interests, and our best option for peace. We must give diplomacy a chance to work.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House of Representatives will stand on the right side of history in rejecting this dangerous deal. I have asked myself, as many people in this Chamber have asked, "Why is this a good deal for the United States?"

Iran is holding four Americans illegally hostage in their country. That was not part of the negotiations. Iran continues to support worldwide terrorism. There is no restrictions on that in this deal.

Fifty billion dollars will be immediately released to the regime with no restrictions on its use. That was not part of the deal. They continue to develop ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic

missiles, that could reach the American mainland. There were no restrictions on that during this deal.

We are told by the administration that, if we reject this deal, the rest of the P5+1 will not join us. Well, last week Iran's top cleric said America remains Iran's number one enemy.

Days after the deal was announced, Iran's Supreme Leader called for "death of America," not the death of France, not the death of Great Britain, not the death of Russia, not the death of China. It was the death of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, since when is America afraid to stand alone?

I was one of the fortunate freshman that got to go to Israel recently and I sat with the Prime Minister, who told us this deal guarantees that, in 15 years, Iran will have a nuclear arsenal. Just yesterday the Supreme Leader tweeted that Israel won't exist in 25 years.

I also visited the Holocaust Museum and, like many people who weren't alive during that historic tragedy, I asked myself, "Why didn't anyone stop this?" Well, my fear is that some day in the near future people are going to ask, "Why didn't America stop Iran?"

The bottom line is that this is a bad deal for America. It is a bad deal for Israel, and it is a bad deal for the world.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this historic agreement with Iran. It is good for America, absolutely critical for Israel, and is a historic step toward a more stable Middle East.

We entered into P5+1 negotiations with one prevailing goal, to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. That is what this agreement does.

Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon. I want to repeat that because there has been a lot of false reports and fearmongering about Iran being able to build a bomb in 10 years or 15 years. Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon.

This is the third provision of the deal: "Iran affirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons."

Iran has agreed to never have a nuclear weapon. With this agreement in place, we will have an unprecedented inspection regimen to guarantee it.

IAEA inspectors will have more access in Iran than in any other country

in the world. No nuclear site is off limits. They will have access wherever they need it, whenever they need it, and at every single stage of the process.

This agreement is built on verification and full cooperation. If Iran fails to meet either of those standards, if at any point inspectors believe that Iran is stonewalling or being uncooperative, the deal is violated and strict sanctions return.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good deal, and there is no possibility of a so-called better deal. Our partner nations have made it clear that, if we walk away from this agreement, they will not support the tough sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place.

That is the reality. As a result, a vote against this agreement is a vote to weaken international sanctions against Iran. It is a vote to allow them a clear path to a nuclear weapon, and it is a vote to make Israel less safe and the Middle East more dangerous.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that reality, to support this agreement and allow our President and our Nation to take these historic steps toward a more peaceful world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to President Obama's disastrous Iran nuclear deal. This deal not only threatens the safety and security of the United States, one of our closest allies, Israel, it threatens the safety and security of the entire world.

It fails to prevent Iran from eventually having a nuclear weapon, the exact opposite of what it is intended to do. Iran now simply just has to wait a decade before becoming a nuclear power.

In the meantime, because Iran gets everything they need and want in return for so-called reductions in their nuclear capabilities, they can dramatically expand their dominance in the region, build up their ballistic missile and weapons capabilities, grow their economy and military, and have even greater ability to fund and promote terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, can we really expect to trust a government like Iran's whose leaders chant "Death to America"?

I strongly advise my colleagues to oppose this horrible deal. Our Nation and our allies deserve better.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action not as a perfect agreement, but as the only viable path forward to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I do not come to this decision lightly or easily.

Iran is a deadly state sponsor of terrorism, and the Iranian regime has repeatedly threatened America and our close ally, Israel.

Despite decades of sanctions by the United States, Iran has come within months of succeeding in its effort to acquire sufficient material for a nuclear bomb.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is not, Is this a perfect agreement that addresses all of Iran's dangerous behavior? The truth is there are no perfect options in dealing with this regime.

Instead, we must ask: "Will this agreement verifiably prevent a nuclear armed Iran? Will this agreement advance American national security interests in the region? Will this agreement advance the national security of our ally, Israel?"

Through a very long and deliberate process, I have reached the conclusion that the answer to these three questions is yes.

I believe that it is better to have this imperfect international agreement that we can aggressively enforce than to have no agreement at all.

During August I spent a week in Israel meeting with political and military leaders and hearing from ordinary citizens who are deeply concerned about Iran's intentions.

As I stood on the Golan Heights, I could see the smoke rising from shelling in Syria. That smoke is a visible sign of the chaos and danger in the region for both the United States and for the entire Middle East.

I am keenly aware of the very real threats Iran poses to Israel's security and to our national security. I share the deep concerns of many of my constituents, of many Jewish leaders, who distrust Iran.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, after this week's vote, we have another critical choice to make. It is an important choice to make for our children, our grandchildren, and our men and women in uniform.

Our choice is this: Will we come together as Americans to enforce the Iranian nuclear agreement in the years to come?

As the Iran nuclear agreement goes into effect, we must work together—no matter our vote this week—to enforce Iran's commitments and to stand prepared to act decisively when Iran tests our resolve. We cannot afford to cast a vote and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, we have the greatest opportunity to achieve stability in the region when we lead our allies and work with other international partners, as we did when we created the international sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table.

The Iranian nuclear agreement is the beginning of a long-term, multinational commitment. We must stand strong with our allies. We must commit to ensuring that the inspectors have the access and resources to carry out the agreement.

We must stand ready to act, to lead the world to respond to signs of cheating or other Iranian efforts to undermine its obligations.

□ 1615

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge rejection of the underlying Iranian agreement. The President did not submit to Congress two inspection side agreements secretly negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

Congress and the American people have no information on what these secret side agreements entail, although news reports have suggested that Iran will be able to inspect at least some of its own military facilities.

Under the underlying agreement, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism—an antagonist of the United States, of Israel, and of several Arab nations, a 35-year-old regime known for horrible human rights abuses—will receive at least \$100 billion immediately, some of which will undoubtedly be used for terrorism.

A better underlying agreement can be negotiated, making sure Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons or ICBMs whose only purpose can be militaristic. It is important to note that a clear majority of the American people and a clear majority of both houses of Congress—Republicans and some Democrats, together the representatives of the American people—oppose this deal.

This is the most consequential vote I shall cast as a Member of Congress on foreign policy since I have been privileged to be here.

I urge rejection of the Iranian agreement, which is not in the best interests of the national security of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just clear up some things. The IAEA's separate arrangements with Iran are not part of the agreement within the definition of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. The separate arrangements were negotiated between the IAEA and Iran to resolve outstanding issues. The arrangements between Iran and the IAEA are considered safeguard confidenceals, meaning that the IAEA does not share the information with member states.

The U.S. also has safeguard confidenceals, arrangements with the IAEA, and we would not want any member state to be able to request access to information about our nuclear infrastructure.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, IAEA Director General Amano has declared that the arrangements between the IAEA and Iran are technically sound and consistent with the Agency's long-established practice. They do not compromise the IAEA safeguard standards in any way.

Let's be clear. There is no self-inspection of Iranian facilities, and the IAEA has in no way given responsibility for nuclear inspections to Iran, not now and certainly not in the future. That is not how the IAEA does business.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against a deal which I believe will become one of the most dangerous mistakes in U.S. history. This deal does not stop Iran from pursuing a nuclear program. It recognizes and legitimizes their nuclear program in short order.

It allows Iran to develop ballistic missiles and brings an end to the arms embargo against that regime. It frees up hundreds of billions of dollars to fund and export terrorism. I am convinced that this deal will also lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. This deal, Mr. Speaker, is one of the biggest mistakes that we, our children, and our grandchildren will pay a very dear price for.

Mr. Speaker, history will record this deal as the moment that the United States and the world granted the largest, most dangerous sponsor of terrorism that which it covets the most, nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

I hope I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I fear that I am not.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that this agreement isn't based on trust. It is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history. The international inspectors will have 24/7 access to surveillance of enrichment facilities and reactors and regular non-restricted access to all other declared sites.

Beyond declared facilities, the inspection provisions give the international inspectors the access they need, when they need it, to carry out the most intrusive inspection system ever peacefully negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has a lot of heroes. SAM JOHNSON is one of those. I am proud to have followed him, and I salute him.

I have been fortunate to do many things. I was an Army officer in West Germany, a high school teacher, and a local elected official. Now, as a Member of Congress, I am honored to cast votes for the people that I represent.

My constituents want the President to follow the law, as is his responsibility under article II of the Constitution. The President did not submit all the necessary documents as required

under the law. I and my constituents want to know what is in these side agreements.

To my colleague from Maryland, those assurances are not good enough when we are going down this path of peace and war to trust the IAEA with no documents, not being able to see that.

Our primary responsibility here is to protect our citizens against all enemies, foreign and domestic. This deal gives Iran more money. They will remain the number one state sponsor of terror. They will continue to chant "death to America" and "death to Israel." They will not free our citizens.

Now, we assure that Iran will get nuclear weapons; the region will go into a nuclear arms race, and the world and the U.S. will be less safe. This is a terrible deal, an embarrassing deal, and one we will regret in the future.

Vote to fully disclose this deal; vote against the deal, and vote to keep the sanctions on.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants Iran to have a nuclear weapon; I certainly don't think the President wants them to, but I think it is clear that they are going to. The question is when. Clearly, the President tried to make a good deal. I don't think he thinks that Iran can be trusted, but I do think he thinks that they won't cheat.

Mr. Speaker, the road to hell was paved with good intentions, and I am sure that the administration had and has good intentions, but the facts remain. Iran has been cheating, literally, for thousands of years—or at least that region has—and certainly, we know the facts.

The facts are, for the last 36 years, Iran has cheated on every single agreement they have signed. They are cheating at this very moment. An agreement that is based on that, that they wouldn't cheat, is an agreement that is fatally flawed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same country that won't cheat, this is the same country that leaders recognize and recommend the stoning of women, the hanging of homosexuals, the sponsor of mass terrorism. This is the nation that we have signed an accord with.

Mr. Speaker, the other side will tell you that this is a great agreement with robust controls and an inspection paradigm. With all due respect, none of us know what that is; yet the pillar of this agreement is based upon solely that, an inspection paradigm that is so robust that Iran can't cheat, and no one knows what it is. We are literally voting for something and on something that we don't know what it is, and we are being urged to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, Iran cannot be trusted. The blood will not be on my hands from these rockets that Hamas launches into Israel and these American soldiers that come home in body bags in the future.

I just want to let everybody know that the blood will not be on my hands and the hands of those who vote against this agreement.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate all day, and I really have to be, I guess, angered by the amount of misstatement of fact here and about this House being so negative about this country and about our President.

You can't get away with criticizing Presidents or leaders of other countries being negative about us when you are standing around being negative about our own country and our own President.

This agreement is about trust, and it isn't about trust with Iran. It is about trust with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Nobody has spoken about what that Agency does, other than the chairman, about how important it is.

It has been around since 1957. We helped create it. It has 2,400 employees. We probably trained most of them. They know about inspections. They are an international organization. They don't belong to anybody. No country owns them.

You can't go and trash all day that they have a secret agreement with Iran when they have a secret agreement with the United States and with Russia and with China and with all the other signatories. That is their business. They go in and verify.

We don't allow them to go into our top classified areas without some agreement of how you are going to handle that classified information. They are not going to release that information to other countries. They wouldn't have any credibility.

When you are asking that the President release that information, he doesn't have it. He doesn't own it. It is the IAEA and Iran. What if Iran was saying, We don't want to enter into this agreement because we don't know what the IAEA has entered into with the United States?

Stop trashing the process. Trust this organization. We have been proud of it for 58 years. It is the top cop on nuclear inspections, all the 1,100 facilities around the world, nuclear power plants, military bases with nuclear equipment, weapons. They are the inspectors. They are the ones that trust and verify. Give them a chance.

Everybody in the world thinks this is the toughest agreement ever negotiated. Why would we not be celebrating it? This is diplomatic history. We have done great things here, and you want to trash it, and you want to trash the administration. That is not America. Give peace a chance.

Vote “no” on this awful bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have seen this before. Some of us were around for the North Korean nuclear agreement, and President Obama’s Iran nuclear deal looks increasingly like the dangerous deal that we struck with that regime in North Korea.

In 1994, the U.S. Government signed a deal with North Korea that, according to then-President Clinton, would make the United States, the Korean peninsula, and the world safer, in his words.

The agreement, we were told, did not rely on trust, but would instead involve a verification program which would stop the North Koreans from ever acquiring a nuclear bomb. That sounds familiar today.

Unfortunately, the North Korean deal had holes that you could fire a ballistic missile through. The deal did not dismantle North Korea’s program. It committed the United States to rewarding North Korea with large quantities of fuel oil without requiring the regime to implement the terms.

Worst of all, the deal relied on inspection provisions that were naive and ultimately were worthless. The predictable result was that, on October 4, 2002, North Korea revealed it had been lying all along and that it had continued to secretly develop nuclear weapons.

Four years later, North Korea’s dictator, Kim Jong Il, ordered an underground nuclear test, and today, North Korea is a global menace, and it supports and sponsors terrorism, and it is the most unstable nuclear power on Earth. There is a reason why some of us raise these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Iran deal because it paves the way for Iran to obtain nuclear capabilities that will not only threaten Israel and create an arms race in the Middle East, but will also be a direct threat to America.

□ 1630

Time and time again, the Government of Iran has demonstrated its unwillingness to be transparent and open regarding their nuclear arms development and fraudulent behavior. Let’s not forget that we just recently discovered two of their secret nuclear facilities, and who knows how many more they have.

The sanctions relief included as part of this deal guarantees that Iran, the world’s number one sponsor of terrorism, will have billions more to fund their evil acts. And if there is any confusion, Iran’s stated intentions of wiping Israel off the face of the Earth and its public chants of “death to America” make their intentions very clear.

Mr. Speaker, America has always stood for what is right—the greatest

force for good mankind has ever known. Let’s keep it that way and defend this agreement.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this deal. This is a terrible deal for America, for the Middle East, and for the world.

This is a deal that can’t be verified. The IAEA, as so eloquently talked about by my colleague across the aisle, is the same IAEA that had their inspector buying nuclear material for North Korea.

This is a deal that will embolden Iran. It will make them stronger. They are the number one sponsor of terrorism in the world, shouting, “Death to America.” When they stop having the rhetoric from their Ayatollah and from their President saying “death to America” and they start denouncing terrorism and release our hostages, then we can go forward with this. But this will do nothing but embolden Iran, make them stronger, and make the Middle East more unstable.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The Congress is not on the clock, because we haven’t received the entire agreement. And for anyone out there who wants to be supportive of this deal, let’s think what the President was telling the American public and all of us.

The House has a deal that wasn’t based on trust; it is built on verification. How do you support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification is?

I would be happy to yield if anyone wanted to stand up and explain how you support a deal without knowing what the verification is. You can’t. That is why we are asking for it.

And for those who say that opposing this deal is somehow negative towards America, I took an oath to be an officer of the United States military, willing to fight and die in protection of our freedoms and liberties. I love this country. I took an oath to serve here the members of my district because I love America.

So don’t tell me that somehow opposing this deal is negative toward America. I oppose this deal because I love my country.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, did you notice something? Did you notice that, for the past 2 years, the President of the United States has said that if we were going to have a deal, it was going to be based on full disclosure?

Mr. Speaker, the President said that we were going to know all of the infor-

mation. And the State Department submitted to the Congress a document that said: Here is all the information.

But after that, Mr. Speaker, you know what we found out? There are two secret deals. There are two secret side deals, side arrangements, that we have not seen.

Now, think about it. There are two alternatives: either this is sacrosanct between the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Iranian Government and no one is allowed to see it under the law—no one absolutely; it is totally confidential—or it is not.

Now, how can it be, Mr. Speaker, that some elements of the administration have been briefed on those documents but they have not been disclosed to Congress and they have not been disclosed to the American public? How can that be?

I will tell you how it can be. Because this is absurd. The administration has not disclosed material information.

And so why are we here today? Why is Chairman ROYCE managing this time? Why are we contemplating this resolution that is brought forth by Congressman POMPEO and Congressman ZELDIN? It is to say this: Administration, you have not complied. Therefore, Corker-Cardin has not been invoked. Therefore, the House is not going to vote on this nefarious deal.

This is an awful deal, Mr. Speaker, and it should be wholeheartedly rejected with all urgency. I urge the passage of this resolution to make it very clear that we are not going to be complicit. We are not going to be complicit, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to be midwives and bring into the world this awful thing. We won’t be complicit.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A few speakers ago, there was a statement made about folks loving America. Well, guess what. We all love America. The fact that we may have disagreements with regard to this proposal does not take away from our love of this great country. We may differ, but the fact still remains that we love our country. And I just want to make that clear, because it is sickening to hear those kinds of comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. The American people have spoken and overwhelmingly oppose this agreement. Our allies in the region, who know Iran best, oppose this deal. The President, enabled by Senate Democrats, continues to live in a fantasyland.

The President’s track record in the region is appalling: Libya, Yemen, Somalia, Benghazi, the reset with Russia, red lines in Syria, his failed ISIL strategy, and his catastrophic withdrawal from Iraq, just to name a few, now handing billions, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and a legal pathway to a nuclear weapon to Iran.

The American people deserve the truth rather than lies and half-truths about snapback sanctions; secret side deals; anytime, anywhere inspections; Iran's right to enrich uranium or plutonium; and, as we stand here today, Congress' role in this bad deal.

Members of Congress must ask themselves two questions: Does this deal make us more secure? Does this deal make us more safe? The answer to both questions is a resounding, no, it doesn't.

Secretary of State Kerry said "no deal is better than a bad deal." I couldn't agree more.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: Iran is an enemy to the United States of America, not by our declaration but by a proclamation of the most senior military leaders of that nation that have stated their destiny is to destroy the United States of America. Now, I was recently told by the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, that when someone says they want to destroy you, believe them.

So what are we to trust? Are we to trust Iran, when they say that their destination, their goal, is to destroy the people of the United States of America? Or do we trust them when they say that they will commit to not develop a nuclear weapon? Or do we trust an international organization who has details about verification that they won't even share with the representatives of the people of this Nation who would be drastically affected by that?

Oh, yes, but I have been told it is not about trust; it is about verification. But the details of the most critical part of that verification are being kept secret from the Members of this Congress who are expected to approve this deal that would have drastic effects upon the people of the United States.

I would submit to you that those who chant "death to America," the leaders in Iran, know the details of it.

We must stop this now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman for the work that he has done on this issue and the awareness that he has helped to raise not only with Members of this body, but with the American people.

The American people are speaking out. They do not want this Iran deal to be on the books. And there are good reasons why.

As I was home and talking to my constituents, many are like me. They are a mom, they are a grandmother, and they fear for what this will do to our country. They fear for what it will

do to the safety of our children and future generations. They are asking the right questions:

Does Iran deserve the right to be trusted? Absolutely not.

When their neighbors don't trust them, should we trust them? The answer is of course not.

Is this a transparent agreement? Of course not. The secret side deals that have been made, why would we do that? Why would we incentivize, create a pathway, for Iran to have a nuclear weapon?

I think what we should do is require the President to come forward with every component to expose this so we know what kind of future this creates for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Returning to an argument I was making earlier about this body's experience with North Korea, it does look to me like many are willing to concede to Iran the same loopholes that we gave North Korea.

Supreme Leader Ayatollah has declared that his country would never agree to anywhere, anytime inspections. That is what is a little confusing about this. Especially, he says, in Iranian military sites. What we are informed of is that Iran is going to do its own inspection at Parchin. Without a full picture of Iran's nuclear program, without full ability to inspect these sites, we will be verifying in the dark, just as we were with North Korea.

The Ayatollah is also demanding sanctions be lifted before Iran dismantles its nuclear infrastructure. In short, the Supreme Leader, again, is not going to let international inspectors into the places he builds his secret weapons, and yet he wants billions of sanctions in relief that he could funnel into terrorist groups that he funds, including Hezbollah and Hamas.

Just like North Korea, Iran wants its rewards upfront. Again, like North Korea, what is Iran demanding? The best prize of all: the stamp of international legitimacy for its nuclear program.

The truly stunning thing about this nuclear deal is that even if Iran fulfills all of its commitments in a few short years, the mullahs will be free from restraints, have international blessing for Iran's nuclear program, and will have billions of dollars that they will use, in my opinion, for destabilizing the region. Because the IRGC controls most of these business contracts, their military controls the contracts.

It is not too late to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons, but to do so, we need to learn from our mistakes; and if we don't, the Ayatollah, just like Kim Jong-il before him, will have, in my view, an easy path to the bomb.

Mr. CUMMINGS. May I inquire as to how much time we have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes

remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this agreement is not based on trust; it is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history.

There has been a lot of talk about \$100 billion—others have floated other figures—in sanctions relief, but we know that it is more like around \$50 billion, and it is conjecture as to how Iran will spend this money. Our terrorism sanctions will remain firmly in place to combat the money that Iran passes to any terrorist groups.

□ 1645

This is a good deal, not because the President says so, not because I say so, not because anyone else in this Chamber says so. It is a good deal because the experts say so.

Nuclear physicists, disarmament experts, antinuclear proliferation experts, members of the intelligence community—including the former head of Mossad—and our allies all agree that the right thing to do to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is to support this deal.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Neville Chamberlain landed at Heston Aerodrome on September 30, 1938, and spoke to the crowds. He said: "The settlement of the Czechoslovakian problem has been achieved."

He said, "This morning I had another talk with German Chancellor, Herr Hitler, and here is the paper that bears his name on it, as well as mine."

He went on to say, "We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war again."

Later that day, he stood outside of 10 Downing Street and read again. He said: "My good friends, for the second time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honour."

He said, "I believe it is a peace for our time. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts. Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

Mr. Speaker, we all know how that turned out.

My friends, if this deal passes—and make no mistake, it is quite a deal for Iran—Americans will not get a quiet night's sleep.

As long as Barack Hussein Obama is in office aiding and abetting the Iranian terroristic regime, we will not be safe and Americans will not sleep well.

This is a bad deal. You don't argue, you don't make deals with the devil, deals with the enemy. Do we not learn from history?

Did we not learn anything from World War II?

This is a bad deal. I urge my colleagues to vote this deal down. It is time to put America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some try to demean the importance of what the chairman and others here on the Republican side are trying to do right now.

The fact is that, when we talk about the information that has not been provided about the outside agreements with the IAEA, it is not only material, relevant, but it is also critical.

I am reading directly from the Iran deal. Eight years after the adoption date or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, whichever is earlier—it goes on to talk about sanctions that will be lifted.

Another place, same thing, or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, then another protocol is lifted.

If we don't know what the agreement is with the IAEA, then these years mean nothing. The IAEA, I have already heard say, as far as it knows, nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes. That would mean that these years are worthless.

We have got to have the secret agreements.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

With regard to what the gentleman just stated, I would refer him to Senator BOB CORKER, who drafted the process that gave Congress the right to review the agreement. In talking about this situation that we are addressing today, he says that the motion is not worth considering. Apparently, he feels satisfied that the arrangement with regard to the IAEA has been satisfied.

Let's also focus with the matter at hand, and the matter at hand is preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, instead of working on pointless partisan measures like this one and others we will be considering tomorrow.

This entire piece of legislation that we have been debating is about accusations that the President did not comply with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. Even, as I said a moment ago, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee does not believe that.

Let's get back to the business of the people and stop wasting their money and wasting their time.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I guess the point that I would begin by making is that Iran won't have to cheat like North Korea did to get close to a bomb, and that is because the essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology expire or, in the words of the agreement, sunset in 10 to 15 years.

After these restrictions expire, Iran will be left with an internationally recognized industrial scale nuclear program. Iran could even legitimately enrich to levels near weapons-grade under the pretext of powering a nuclear navy. All these activities are permissible under the nonproliferation treaty, and all would be endorsed by this agreement.

Indeed, to quote the President, President Obama said, of this agreement, in year 13, 14, 15, Iran's breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero.

A former State Department official testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that this sunset clause is a disaster. It is a disaster as it will enable the leading state sponsor of terrorism to produce enough material for dozens of nuclear weapons, all under the terms of the agreement.

As another expert witness pointed out, the bet that the administration is taking is that, in 10 to 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran. The agreement does not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Iran doesn't have to dismantle any centrifuges or give up any of its nuclear facilities. Even Iran's once-secret facility at Fordo, buried under a mountain top, does stay open.

Instead, the deal temporarily restricts elements of the program. It does do that. It restricts elements of the program, but it does it in exchange for something else that is permanent.

What is permanent in this, as opposed to temporary? What is permanent is the sanctions relief. Key restrictions begin to expire after only 8 years.

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime, which Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations.

I will remind the Members again, this was a hard-fought case over several administrations; and, in point of fact, in the prior Congress, myself and ELIOT ENGEL had legislation which would have put additional pressure on Iran that passed here by a vote of 400-20.

It was the administration and it was Secretary of State Kerry who made certain that that bill was bottled up in the Senate and could not see the light of day.

Now, the billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get up front will support

its terrorist activity, but those billions are just a downpayment, as this agreement reconnects Iran to the global economy.

One of the things that bothers me most about this is that Iran is not a normal country with normal businessmen running those companies. When those companies were nationalized, they were turned over to the IRGC. They were turned over, basically, to the leaders in the military, and they were turned over to the clerics.

As future contracts go forward with Iran, it is that entity that is going to be rewarded. It is going to have the political power.

For those of us that hoped to see change in Iran, now the best connected people in Iran are going to be the IRGC leaders. If we think for a minute what that will mean for those that would like to see real change, I think we lost a historic opportunity here to put the kind of pressure that would have forced change, but we did not do that.

In a major, last-minute concession—and this is the final point I would make—the President agreed to lift the U.N. arms embargo on Iran, and in 5 years, Iran will be able to buy conventional weapons and, in 8 years, ballistic missiles.

Russia and China want to sell these dangerous weapons to Iran, and that is why they pushed. That is why it was Russia pushing, at the eleventh hour, after we thought this agreement was done.

The reason we were waiting those extra days is because Russia was running interference for Iran, saying: Oh, no, wait. We also want the arms embargo lifted, including the ICBM embargo lifted.

As the Secretary of Defense of our country testified, the reason that we want to stop Iran from having an ICBM program is that the "I" in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability of flying from Iran to the United States.

Ask yourself why Iran wants to build ICBMs, why it is that the Ayatollah says it is the duty of every military man to figure out how to help mass-produce ICBMs.

Someone once asked President Kennedy the difference between our space program and the ICBM program that Russia was building at that time, and he quipped "attitude." Kennedy's answer was "attitude."

The answer here is that attitude counts for a lot, and the attitude in the regime, when they say they are not even going to be bound by this and are now going to transfer rockets and missiles to Hezbollah and Hamas, tells us a lot about their attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, for years, the Congress, the President, our European partners, and the international community have imposed a series of tough economic sanctions on Iran with the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Those

sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table and I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the entire team, along with our P5+1 partners, for their efforts to negotiate an agreement to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

The question for Members of Congress, who will vote on this agreement, is whether it achieves its stated goals. Given the importance of this question, I believe every Member of Congress has an obligation to thoroughly review the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), consider the testimony presented at the Congressional hearings, and listen to competing views before reaching a final judgment.

Since the JCPOA was submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, I have carefully reviewed all of its terms, attended the classified briefings and numerous presentations, and reviewed the transcripts of all the hearings that have been held in both the House and the Senate. I have also met with opponents and supporters of the agreement. While I respect the opinions of those on both sides of this issue, I have concluded that this agreement advances the national security interests of the United States and all of our allies, including our partner Israel. This agreement is the best path to achieve our goal—that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. Indeed, I firmly believe that, should Congress block this agreement, we would undermine that goal, inadvertently weaken and isolate America, and strengthen Iran.

The benefit of any agreement must be measured against the real-world consequences of no agreement. Many forget that when these negotiations began in earnest two years ago, Iran was a threshold nuclear weapons state and remains so until and unless this agreement is implemented. As Prime Minister Netanyahu warned at the United Nations in 2012, Iran was a few months away from having enough highly enriched uranium to produce its first bomb. Today, prior to the implementation of this agreement, it has a nuclear stockpile that, if further enriched, could produce up to 10 bombs. It currently has installed nearly 20,000 centrifuges that could convert that fuel into weapons material. Indeed, many analysts believe that the combination of Iran's nuclear stockpile and its centrifuges would allow it to produce enough weapons-grade nuclear material for a bomb in two months.

In addition, Iran has been enriching some of its nuclear material at its deep underground reactor at Fordow, a very difficult target to hit militarily. Moreover, Iran was in the process of building a heavy-water reactor at Arak, which could generate plutonium to be used for a nuclear weapon. Finally, Iran has been operating for years under an inadequate verification regime that increases the risks of a covert program going undetected.

This agreement blocks all of these paths to acquiring weapons-grade nuclear material and puts in place an inspection system that assures the detection of any violation and future dash to acquire a nuclear weapon. The Interim Agreement has already neutralized Iran's stockpile of highly enriched uranium that Prime Minister Netanyahu highlighted in his speech. This final agreement will significantly scale back the remainder of its program. Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium will be cut from 9,900 kg to 300 kg, and that remainder will be limited to low-enriched uranium that cannot be

used for a weapon. In addition, the agreement removes two-thirds of Iran's installed centrifuges. No enrichment activities may be conducted at Fordow for a period of 15 years, and the facility at Arak will be permanently converted to one that does not produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Taken together, these measures will extend the breakout time from about two months to at least a year and put in place layers of verification measures over different timelines, including some that remain in place permanently. It is generally agreed that these measures would allow us to detect any effort by Iran to use its current nuclear facilities—Natanz, Fordow, or Arak—to violate the agreement. The main criticism with respect to verification is that the agreement does not sufficiently guard against an effort by Iran to develop a secret uranium supply chain and enrichment capacity at a covert place. However, the reality is that the agreement permanently puts in place an inspection mechanism that is more rigorous than any previous arms control agreement and more stringent than the current system. The agreement ultimately requires inspections of any suspected Iranian nuclear site with the vote of the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the European Union. Neither the Chinese nor the Russians can block such inspections in the face of a united Western front. Are we really better off without this verification regime than with it?

In exchange for rolling back its nuclear program and accepting this verification regime, Iran will obtain relief from those sanctions that are tied to its nuclear program. However, that relief will only come after Iran has verifiably reduced its nuclear program as required. Moreover, if Iran backslides on those commitments, the sanctions will snap back into place. The snapback procedure is triggered if the U.S. registers a formal complaint against Iran with the special commission created for that purpose. In addition, those U.S. sanctions that are not related to the Iranian nuclear program will remain in place, including U.S. sanctions related to Iran's human rights violations, support for terrorism, and missile program.

There are some who oppose the agreement because it does not prevent Iran from engaging in adversarial actions throughout the Gulf, the Middle East, and elsewhere. That conduct, however, was never within the scope of these negotiations nor the objective of the international sanctions regime aimed at preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. President Reagan understood the distinction between changing behavior and achieving verifiable limits on weapons programs. He negotiated arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, not because he thought it would change the character of "the Evil Empire" but because limiting their nuclear arsenal was in the national security interests of the U.S. and our allies. That reality is also true today. An Iranian regime with nuclear capability would present a much greater threat to the region than an Iran without one. In fact, today, as a threshold nuclear weapons state, Iran wields more influence than it will under the constraints of this agreement. That is why our focus has appropriately been on reining in the Iranian nuclear program.

The lifting of the sanctions will certainly give Iran additional resources to support its priorities. Given the political dynamic in Iran, some of those additional resources will likely be in-

vested to improve the domestic standard of living. But even if all the resources were used to support their proxies in the region, respected regional observers agree that they are unlikely to make a significant strategic difference. Moreover, any effort by Iran to increase support for its proxies can be checked by the U.S. and our allies through countermeasures. Finally, it is clear that any alternative agreement opponents seek would also result in the lifting of the sanctions and freeing up these resources.

In my view, opponents of the agreement have failed to demonstrate how we will be in a better position if Congress were to block it. Without an agreement, the Iranians will immediately revert to their status as a threshold nuclear weapons state. In other words, they immediately pose the threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned about in his U.N. speech. At the same time, the international consensus we have built for sanctions, which was already starting to fray, would begin to collapse entirely. We would be immediately left with the worst of all worlds—a threshold nuclear weapons state with diminished sanctions and little leverage for the United States.

I disagree with the view that we can force the Iranians back to the negotiating table to get a better deal. All of our European partners have signed on to the current agreement. Consequently, the U.S. would be isolated in its quest to return to negotiations. And in the unlikely event that we somehow returned to negotiations, the critics have not presented a plausible scenario for achieving a better agreement in a world where fewer sanctions means less economic pressure.

The bottom line is that if Congress were to block the agreement and the Iranians were to resume nuclear enrichment activities, the only way to stop them, at least temporarily, would be by military action. That would unleash significant negative consequences that could jeopardize American troops in the region, drag us into another ground war in the Middle East, and trigger unpredictable responses elsewhere. Moreover, the United States would be totally isolated from most of the world, including our Western partners. The folly of that go-it-alone military approach would be compounded by the fact that such action would only deal a temporary setback to an Iranian nuclear program. They would likely respond by putting their nuclear enrichment activities deeper underground and would likely be more determined than ever to build a nuclear arsenal.

We don't have to take that path. This agreement will give us a long period of time to test the Iranians' compliance and assess their intentions. During that period, it will give us a treasure trove of information about the scope and capabilities of the limited Iranian nuclear program. Throughout that period and beyond, we reserve all of our options, including a military option, to respond to any Iranian attempt to break out and produce enough highly enriched material to make a bomb. But we will have two advantages over the situation as it is today—a more comprehensive verification regime to detect any violation and a much longer breakout period in which to respond.

As former Secretary Clinton has indicated, the fact that we have successfully limited the scope of Iran's nuclear program does not mean we have limited its ambitions in the region. We must continue to work with our

friends and allies to constantly contain and confront Iranian aggression in the region. The United States and Israel must always stand together to confront that threat. The fact remains that Iranian support for their terrorist proxy Hezbollah continues to destabilize Lebanon and poses a direct threat to Israel, as does its support for Hamas. We must do all we can to ensure that our ally Israel maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, including providing increased funding for Israel's Arrow anti-ballistic missile and Iron Dome anti-rocket systems. Consideration should also be given to previously denied weapons if a need for such enhanced capabilities arises. We must always remember that some of Iran's leaders have called for the destruction of Israel and we must never forget the awful past that teaches us not to ignore those threats.

The threats Iran poses in the region are real. But all those threats are compounded by an Iran that is a threshold nuclear weapons state. This agreement will roll back the Iranian nuclear program and provide us with greater ability to detect and more time to respond to any future Iranian attempt to build a nuclear weapon.

For all of the reasons given above, I've concluded that this is an historic agreement that should be supported by the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 186, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—245

Abraham	Comstock	Gosar
Aderholt	Conaway	Gowdy
Allen	Cook	Granger
Amash	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Amodel	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Babin	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Crenshaw	Griffith
Barr	Culberson	Grothman
Barton	Curbelo (FL)	Guinta
Benishek	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Denham	Hanna
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hardy
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Harper
Black	DesJarlais	Harris
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Blum	Dold	Heck (NV)
Bost	Donovan	Hensarling
Boustany	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Duncan (TN)	Hill
Bridenstine	Ellmers (NC)	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Emmer (MN)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Fincher	Huizenga (MI)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Hultgren
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Hunter
Burgess	Fleming	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Flores	Hurt (VA)
Calvert	Forbes	Issa
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Fox	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Franks (AZ)	Johnson (OH)
Chaffetz	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Jolly
Coffman	Gibbs	Jones
Cole	Gibson	Jordan
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Joyce
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	Katko

Kelly (MS)	Noem	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shimkus
King (IA)	Nunes	Shuster
King (NY)	Olson	Simpson
Kinziger (IL)	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Kline	Palmer	Smith (NE)
Knight	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Pearce	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Perry	Stefanik
Lamborn	Pittenger	Stewart
Lance	Pitts	Stivers
Latta	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)
Long	Pompeo	Thornberry
Loudermilk	Posey	Tiberi
Love	Price, Tom	Tipton
Lucas	Ratcliffe	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Reed	Turner
Lummis	Reichert	Upton
MacArthur	Renacci	Valadao
Marchant	Ribble	Wagner
Marino	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Massie	Rigell	Walden
McCarthy	Roby	Walker
McCaul	Roe (TN)	Walorski
McClintock	Rogers (AL)	Walters, Mimi
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Rokita	Wenstrup
Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
McSally	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
Meadows	Roskam	Whitfield
Meehan	Ross	Williams
Messer	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Mica	Rouzer	Wittman
Miller (FL)	Royce	Womack
Miller (MI)	Russell	Woodall
Moolenaar	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Mooney (WV)	Salmon	Yoho
Mullin	Sanford	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Scalise	Young (IA)
Murphy (PA)	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Neugebauer	Scott, Austin	Zeldin
Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lipinski
Aguilar	F.	Loeb
Ashford	Duckworth	Loeb
Bass	Edwards	Lofgren
Beatty	Ellison	Lowenthal
Becerra	Engel	Lowe
Bera	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham
Beyer	Esty	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lujan, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Fattah	(NM)
Bonamici	Foster	Lynch
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
F.	Fudge	Matsui
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Gallagher	McDermott
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McGovern
Bustos	Graham	McNerney
Butterfield	Grayson	Meeks
Capps	Green, Al	Meng
Capuano	Green, Gene	Moore
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Moulton
Carney	Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Nadler
Cartwright	Hastings	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Neal
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Himes	Norcross
Cicilline	Hinojosa	O'Rourke
Clark (MA)	Honda	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Pascarella
Clay	Huffman	Payne
Cleaver	Israel	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Cohen	Jeffries	Peters
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Pingree
Cooper	Kaptur	Pocan
Costa	Keating	Polis
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cuellar	Kildee	Rangel
Cummings	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeGette	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Lawrence	Sanchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lee	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Lewis	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
		Schiff

Schrader	Swalwell (CA)	Veasey
Scott (VA)	Takai	Vela
Scott, David	Takano	Velázquez
Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Sherman	Titus	Wasserman
Sinema	Tonko	Schultz
Sires	Torres	Waters, Maxine
Slaughter	Tsongas	Watson Coleman
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Welch
Speier	Vargas	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Maloney,	Wilson (FL)
Carolyn	

□ 1722

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 492, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3461

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.

Congress does favor the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the Foreign Affairs Committee, we have held 30 hearings and briefings on Iran since these negotiations began. We have reviewed this

agreement in depth; but, Mr. Speaker, I can come to no other conclusion than not only does it come up short, it is fatally flawed and, indeed, dangerous. I will oppose the measure before us. We should have gotten a better deal.

Indeed, when the House passed stiff Iran sanctions legislation—now, this was in 2013—in the prior Congress, we passed this legislation, authored by myself and Mr. ENGEL, by a vote, a bipartisan vote in this body, of 400–20.

The intention of that legislation was to put that additional leverage on Iran and force the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his nuclear program and economic collapse if he did not.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, the Secretary of State and the administration worked to ensure that the other body never took that measure up.

This legislation would have put more pressure, as I say, on Iran and might have led to an acceptable deal; but instead of an ironclad agreement that is verifiable and holds Iran to account, we are considering an agreement that leaves Iran, in a few short years, only steps away from a nuclear weapons program, one that would be on an industrial scale.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology. Instead, it is permitted a vast enrichment capacity, reversing decades of bipartisan nonproliferation policy that never imagined endorsing this type of nuclear infrastructure for any country, never mind a country that lives by the motto “death to America.”

While Members of Congress insisted on anywhere, anytime inspections, U.S. negotiators settled for something called managed access. So, instead of allowing international inspectors into those suspicious sites within 24 hours, it will take 24 days, and that is to commence the process.

Worse, there have been revelations in recent days about an agreement between Iran and the United Nations’ nuclear watchdog. This agreement sets the conditions in which a key Iranian military site that is suspected of nuclear bomb work—suspected in the sense that we have 1,000 pages of evidence of that bomb work—will be explored.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, those details have been kept from Congress. We don’t have those details in our hands; but it is reported that, instead of international inspectors doing the inspecting, the Iranians, themselves, will take the inspection lead. Iran has cheated on every agreement they have signed, so why do we trust them now to self-police?

The deal guts the sanctions web that is putting intense pressure on Iran. Billions will be made available to Iran to pursue its terrorism. Indeed, Iran’s elite Quds Force has transferred funds—and this should bother all of

us—to Hamas. It has committed to rebuild the network of tunnels from Gaza to attack Israel.

Mr. ENGEL and I were in one of those tunnels last year. They have agreed in Iran to replenish the medium-range missile arsenal of Hamas, and they are working right now, they claim, to give precision-guided missiles to Hezbollah. I can tell you I was in Haifa in 2006 when it was under constant bombardment by those types of rockets, but they weren’t precision-guided. Every day, they slammed into the city, and there were 600 victims in the trauma hospital. Now Iran has transferred eightfold the number of missiles, and they want to give them the guidance systems. They need money to pay for those guidance systems.

Iran won late concessions to remove international restrictions on its ballistic missile program and on its conventional arms, and that imperils the security of the region and, frankly, the security of our homeland.

For some, the risks in this agreement are worth it as they see an Iran that is changing for the better. As one supporter of this agreement told our committee, President Obama is betting that, in 10 or 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran.

But that is a bet against everything we have seen out of the regime since the 1979 revolution. Already, Iranian leaders insist that international inspectors won’t see the inside of Iran’s military bases and that Iran can advance its missiles and weapons without breaking the agreement. It is guaranteed that Iran will game the agreement to its advantage.

So we must ask ourselves: Will international bureaucrats call out Iran, knowing that doing so will put this international agreement at risk? We are not calling them out now as they are transferring weapons.

Will this administration, which didn’t even insist that four American hostages come home as part of this agreement, be any tougher on Iran in implementing this deal?

Does this serve the long-term national security interests of the United States? Does it make the world and, frankly, the region more safe? more stable? more secure?

Is there any other reason Iran—an energy rich country—is advancing its nuclear technology other than to make a nuclear weapon?

And why do its leaders chant “death to America” and “death to Israel”?

The New York Times ran a story on Quds Day, which is the national parade. It was some weeks ago. There was President Rouhani—the so-called moderate—marching in that parade. Behind him, the crowd was chanting. It was chanting “death to America.” In front of them, they carried placards on either side of him that read, “Death to Israel.” Why does their leader march in the Quds parade, and why does that refrain constantly come from the clerics?

I hope that all Members will consider these questions as they consider this vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the past 2 years, I have supported our negotiating team in the P5+1. I have favored giving time and space to achieve a diplomatic breakthrough to foreclose Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon. I am grateful for the tireless efforts by President Obama, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and Undersecretary Sherman. I appreciate the work of our P5+1 partners in concluding an agreement with Iran.

But, unfortunately, I cannot support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and I plan to oppose this resolution.

Let me say at the outset, I was troubled that Iran was not asked to stop enriching, while we were talking, despite several U.N. Security Council resolutions calling for a pause; and after using this review period to assess the details of the agreement, I am not convinced that this deal does enough to keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran’s hands.

I have raised questions and concerns throughout the negotiating phase and review period. The answers I have received simply don’t convince me that this deal will keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran’s hands. It may, in fact, strengthen Iran’s position as a destabilizing and destructive influence across the Middle East.

First of all, I don’t believe that this deal gives international inspectors adequate access to undeclared sites—24 days is far, far too long a time. Iran can stall, and, in 24 days, they can cover up whatever they have. I am especially troubled by reports about how the Iranian military base at Parchin will be inspected. With these potential roadblocks, the IAEA inspectors may be unable to finish their investigation into the potential military dimensions of Iran’s nuclear program. I don’t think it is essential that Iran provide a full mea culpa of its past activities, but we should have a clear picture of how far Iran has gotten in developing a nuclear weapon.

I also view as a dangerous concession the sunset of the international sanctions on advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. I was told that these issues were not on the table during the talks; so it is unacceptable to me that, after 5 years, Iran can begin buying advanced conventional weapons and, after 8 years, ballistic missiles. Worse, if Iran were to violate the weakened provisions in this agreement, such an action wouldn’t violate the JCPOA and wouldn’t be subject to snapback sanctions.

In my view, Iran is a grave threat to international stability. It is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. It continues to hold American citizens behind bars on bogus charges, and our prisoners still languish there. We have an agreement. Their release was not part of the agreement. Iran’s actions

have made a bad situation in a chaotic region worse.

Even under the weight of international sanctions these past few years—when Iran had no money, when its currency was worthless, when its economy was in the toilet—Iran found money to support international terror. Iran has been able to support terrorist groups, such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and other violent extremists. Awash in new cash provided by sanctions relief, Iran will be poised to inflict even greater damage in Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel, and our Gulf partners. Iran's leadership has every interest in shoring up support from hard-liners. After all, if a deal goes through, hard-liners will need to be placated.

I can tell you that, within the next few years—in the next Lebanon war with Israel—Hezbollah will have missiles raining down on Israel, and some of those missiles will be paid for by the windfall that Iran is going to get as a result of sanctions being lifted. I think that is unacceptable.

We can have no illusions about what Iran will do with its newfound wealth. We can have no doubt about the malevolent intent of a country's leader who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel" just days after concluding a deal. The ink was not even dry on the deal, and 4 days later, the Supreme Leader led a chant of "death to America." After negotiating with us and agreeing to this agreement, he could not even wait more than 4 days—back to the same old "death to America."

Finally and very importantly, I have a fundamental concern that, 15 years from now, under this agreement, Iran will be free to produce weapons-grade, highly enriched uranium without any limitation. What does that mean? It means Iran will be a legitimized nuclear threshold state after the year 2030, with advanced centrifuges and the ability to stockpile enriched uranium. So, in reality, this agreement does not prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon; it only postpones it.

If Iran pursues that course, I fear it could spark a nuclear arms race across the region. After years of intransigence, I am simply not confident that Iran will be a more responsible partner.

Before I finish, I would also like to say a few words about the debate surrounding this issue so far.

We can disagree on the issues. We should debate the details of any important policy, such as this one, and we must rely on our democratic institutions to carry us forward as they have for so long; but we cannot question the motives of any Member of Congress no matter where he or she stands on this issue.

So, instead of using this time to grind a political ax, let's, instead, look down the road. After all, we know that this deal is going forward, and when that happens, we need to ask how we can make this agreement stronger.

How do we ensure the security of Israel and our other friends and allies

in the region? How do we keep resources out of the hands of terrorists as sanctions are lifted? What support does Congress need to provide so that the United States and our partners can hold Iran to its word and ultimately keep it from getting a bomb?

The time to start answering these questions is now.

That is why, in the days and weeks ahead, I will reach out to colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to chart a path forward. I will be working with Chairman ROYCE and others on both sides of the aisle. I will develop new legislation to counter Iran as it dumps its soon-to-be-acquired billions of dollars into terrorist groups and weapons programs. I will work with other lawmakers toward new initiatives that support Israel and our Middle East allies so that they can stand up to an unleashed Iran; and I will work here in Congress and with the administration to make sure the deal is fully implemented to the letter.

We need to focus on strengthening our deterrence in the region; and, most importantly, we have to work hard to continue to enhance the U.S.-Israel relationship. We must reinvigorate the bipartisan consensus which has been the foundation of America's relationship with Israel; and we must ensure that Israel is able to maintain its qualitative military edge and its ability to defend itself.

The world is watching us this week. The United States is being looked to, not for rhetoric and outrage, but for leadership and resolve. So let's present our arguments and cast our votes. Then let's work together to move forward in a productive way. I appreciate how we have worked together on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairman ROYCE.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan relationship that all of the Members on the Foreign Affairs Committee have, but especially today, the words of Mr. ENGEL that every Member of this House should be mindful that impugning motives, questioning the motives of those who disagree with us, is not conducive to an honest and fair debate over these issues. I thank him for making that point on the floor today.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, when the President started these negotiations with Iran, I think, when you look at the fatal flaw in the beginning of those negotiations, they should have started with one basic premise. That premise, Mr. Speaker, ought to have been to finally force Iran to dismantle their nuclear weapons program.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that was not the objective of these negotiations. In fact, if you look, it seemed there

was more interest on making sure that a deal could be reached that China and Russia and Iran could finally agree to.

And the problem is, when you look at the fatal flaw of that negotiation, what has it yielded? And why is there such strong opposition across the country from members of both parties to this agreement?

I think most Americans recognize that Iran cannot be trusted with a nuclear weapon. Just look at their own rhetoric. Just this week the Ayatollah himself led the chant "death to America."

These are the people that the President is negotiating with to ultimately end up at the end of this deal with the ability to develop not just a nuclear bomb, but a nuclear arsenal, Mr. Speaker.

Just look at the tenets of the deal itself. One of the conditions in the deal actually allows Iran to have more than 5,000 centrifuges. If they comply with the deal, they can keep more than 5,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium.

It took Pakistan about 3,000 centrifuges to develop their bomb, and Iran will have over 5,000 centrifuges if they comply with the deal, let alone if they cheat. And we know the history there.

Let's look at other components of the deal, Mr. Speaker. In this deal, if there is a site that is undeclared and our intelligence along the way over these next few years exposes the fact that there is something there that we want to go look at, that we question whether or not they are cheating, Mr. Speaker, we have to get permission under this deal and wait over 24 days.

Imagine all of the things that can be hidden in 24 days if we have the intelligence that they are cheating. How could this be part of a deal that we would agree to that is in the American best interest?

Ultimately, what we have to come to an agreement on is what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we also ought to be concerned about our allies, Israel, and the other Arab states in the region that have deep, grave concerns about this, others that are indicating that this will start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Within 10 years, you could have nearly a half a dozen states in the Middle East with nuclear arms. This isn't the way we ought to go.

Then, of course, there are the secret side deals. We have seen evidence now that there are secret side deals that the President won't disclose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, under the law that President Obama himself signed, the law actually says the President has to disclose to Congress and the American people all information

related to this deal, including “side agreements.”

And now we are hearing at least two secret side agreements exist, one that allows Iran to actually do their own inspections.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people that this deal is going to allow to inspect their own nuclear facilities. The President ought to release to the American people the details of these secret side agreements right now or withdraw this entire proposal.

President Reagan said, “Trust, but verify.” Under this agreement, President Obama is saying trust Iran to verify. You cannot allow this to go through.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this deal. The President lays out a false premise that it is this deal or war.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is a much different approach, a much better approach, and that is to go get a better deal that protects the interest of the United States of America for today and for decades to come.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very valued member of our committee and one of the subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this House in 1997, a few months after I started serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I said back then that the Iran nuclear program was the greatest single threat to the security of Americans. It was true then. It is true now.

On July 14, a few hours after the deal was published, I came to this floor and said that what this House ought to do is consider a Resolution of Approval of the nuclear deal and to vote it down by a large vote. That is exactly what we will do tomorrow morning.

Let me go through a number of points that proponents and opponents of this deal can both agree on. The first is this resolution is quite a bit different than the one we have been thinking about for the last month.

This is a Resolution of Approval. And even if we vote it down, the President can and will carry out this agreement.

That is very different from the Resolution of Disapproval that we have all talked about and made commitments about.

We don't have any commitments on this resolution. It is a totally new resolution. This resolution will express the feelings of Congress, but will not prevent the President from carrying out the deal.

Second, we can agree this deal is better during the next year and a half than it is the next decade. The controls on Iran's nuclear program are much stronger for the first 10 years than they are thereafter.

Whether you like the deal or hate the deal, you have got to agree that it is better up front than it is in the out-years.

The third thing we can agree on is that the President only promised Iran

that he would sign the deal and that he would carry out the deal and that he would use his veto, as he has threatened to do and has successfully done, in effect—that he would carry out the deal using his powers to do so. That is already settled.

Mr. Speaker, the President never told Iran that Congress would approve this deal. Why should we give Iran more than they bargained for? They bargained for the President's signature together with his freedom to carry out the deal. That is already settled. Why should we give Iran something extra in return for nothing?

We should not vote to approve this deal.

The next thing we can all agree on is that this deal is not a binding agreement as a matter of U.S. Constitutional law or international law.

The Constitution defines a treaty. This is not a treaty and certainly wouldn't get a two-thirds vote confirmation in the Senate.

If you look at the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, this is not a ratified treaty, it is not an unratified treaty, it is not a legislative executive agreement. It is simply an agreement between the executives of the respective governments.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing we can agree on is that we don't know what the best policy for America is in the next decade. Let's keep our options open. Iran is not legally bound by this agreement. Even if they were, they would conveniently ignore that any day of the week.

We cannot feel that we are legally bound. Now, as a legal matter, we are not. But appearances matter. And if this agreement that has been signed by the President gets a positive vote of approval in this House, there will be those around the world who believe that it is binding on the United States, even while, as a legal matter, it is not binding on Iran and, oh, by the way, their legislature hasn't voted to approve it.

So we need freedom of action. What form will that action take? Will we demand that Iran continue to limit its nuclear program beyond year 10, beyond year 15?

After all, we are continuing the sanctions relief all through the next decade. I don't know if that will be the right policy or not.

Mr. Speaker, the current President's hands are untied. He gets to carry out his policy for the remainder of the term. Vote no on this resolution. Because if we vote yes, we are tying the hands of future Presidents in a decade to come.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who currently chairs our Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the hard work of our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE of Cali-

fornia, and our ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, who have done an incredible job throughout—I don't know how many hearings we have had in our Foreign Affairs Committee—highlighting the many flaws of this deal and giving the other side the opportunity to present what is good about this deal.

Mr. Speaker, after all of those hearings in our Foreign Affairs Committee led by Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, it is simple to realize what is before us today. This deal paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran in as little as 15 years.

This deal lifts the arms embargo. This deal lifts the sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program. This deal releases billions of dollars that will allow the regime to increase funding to support terror, as it has been doing, to support its regional hegemonic ambitions.

If all of that were not bad enough, with this deal, the P5+1 countries will actually be obligated to help Iran modernize and advance its nuclear program. Yes. You heard that right. This is important because this modernization requirement gets lost with all of the other many flaws of this deal.

We actually have an agreement before us to help Iran strengthen its ability to protect against nuclear security threats, to protect it against sabotage, to protect all the physical sites.

Incredibly enough, we will be helping Iran with its nuclear program. So now, not only do we have to allow Iran to enrich, not only do we have to allow Iran to become a nuclear threshold state, but, yes, we must actually protect Iran's nuclear program from sabotage and outside threats.

Mr. Speaker, how does a rogue regime that has been in violation of its nonproliferation treaty obligations for decades, a rogue regime that has been in violation of—one, two, three, four, five—six United Nations Security Council resolutions and a regime that violates other international obligations get to be the beneficiary of such protections from the U.S. and other P5+1 countries?

This is madness, Mr. Speaker. It simply defies logic. We must oppose this deal. Let's vote that way.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a very important member of the committee, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I thank the chairman for his leadership in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of points made during this debate. I would like to set some context for the rest of the evening.

Iran's regime is anti-American. They are anti-Israel. They are homophobic. They are misogynistic. They violate the human rights of their people.

Iran's support for terrorists has led directly to the deaths of American citizens. It actively works to destabilize

the Middle East. It vows to destroy Israel.

It is responsible for the death of civilians and members of the military from Beirut to Buenos Aires. It has assisted in Assad's slaughter of 300,000 of his own people.

As we gather here today, four Americans—Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, my constituent Bob Levinson—are in Iran, held by the regime and unable to return home to their families.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I oppose this deal. On the nuclear issue, it does not dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It pauses it.

Now, inspections in Nantanz and Fordow are very positive, as is the monitoring of the fuel cycle and the reduction in enriched uranium. But we cannot access other suspected nuclear sites in less than 24 days.

If we find Iran in violation of this agreement, we cannot restore sanctions to the punishing level of today and, if we snap back sanctions, Mr. Speaker, Iran has the right to cease performing its obligations under the agreement altogether.

□ 1800

While there has been a lot of speculation about what could happen in the absence of a deal, we know that, under this deal, the regime will get billions of dollars to support terrorism; we know the arms embargo will be lifted, meaning that the most advanced weapons will be available to the regime; and we know that the ban on the development of ballistic missiles will be lifted.

Now, I have heard a lot of criticism of those of us who oppose the deal. I don't want war, Mr. Speaker. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from using billions of dollars to cause more violence and its surrogates to cause more bloodshed.

I don't want the start of an arms race. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from developing advanced centrifuges and an industrial nuclear program with an unlimited number of centrifuges so that other nations will not seek nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I don't oppose this deal because of politics or my religion or the people who live in my district. I have simply concluded that the risks are too great.

Now, these past few weeks have been challenging for all of us. Reasonable people can disagree, and I am saddened by the often vitriolic comments hurled at those of us with different views on both sides. I also disagree with the decision by the Republican leadership to make up new rules, ignoring our ability to have an impact right now through the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that passed 400-25.

The consequences of this deal, Mr. Speaker, present us with some harsh realities, but rather than denying them, it is now time for Congress to begin the work of defying them, and it will require bipartisan support to do it.

That means ramping up intelligence sharing and counterterrorism cooperation with Israel and our Gulf partners and making clear to our allies that Iran's violent activities in the region will not be tolerated. It means enhancing Israel's qualitative military edge and making Iran know that the penalties should it cheat and break out to a bomb will be punishing.

It means intensifying sanctions already enshrined in U.S. law for Iranian support for terrorism and violation of human rights. President Obama rightly made this point last week: nothing in this deal prevents the United States from sanctioning people, banks, and businesses that support terrorism, and we must do so together.

What happens next? I will vote against the deal. Mr. Speaker, there will be a day after the final resolution of this nuclear deal, and on that day, this House must work together to ensure that Iran's terrorism is checked and that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. On that, we all agree.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, Congress has passed bipartisan sanctions to get to the point where we are today, and the purpose of these sanctions was to dismantle Iran's nuclear weapons program.

This agreement does not achieve that goal. In fact, this agreement puts Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, on a glidepath to a nuclear bomb. Proponents say it is the only alternative to war, but I believe that is a false choice.

I recently met with Prime Minister Netanyahu, and he agreed that our goal should be a good deal, but that we cannot put our security at risk for a bad deal. Make no mistake, this is a bad deal for America and for our allies.

It will not stop Iran's nuclear program. It will leave Iran with the ingredients for a bomb and infrastructure to build it, and it will spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It will give Iran a cash windfall, freeing up over \$100 billion to fuel the regime's global campaign of Islamist terror.

Incredibly, this agreement lifts restrictions on Iran's ballistic missiles, which the Ayatollah himself said that they will mass-produce. There is only one reason to develop an ICBM, Mr. Speaker, and that is to deliver a nuclear warhead across continents, which means the United States.

A top Iranian general bragged recently that his country will have "a new ballistic missile test in the near future that will be a thorn in the eyes of our enemies."

President Reagan's famous negotiating advice was to "trust, but verify." We can't trust a regime that has cheated on every deal. President Rouhani says his country's centrifuges will

never stop spinning and that they will "buy, sell, and develop any weapons we need and will not ask for permission or abide by any resolution."

Now, the White House is counting on verification measures spelled out in secret side deals between Iran and the IAEA, which Secretary Kerry testified to me that even he has not seen. Astonishingly, the AP reports that the side deal allows Iran to self-inspect its nuclear sites.

Now, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, are expected to vote on this measure without seeing these secret deals, which goes to the heart of verification. This, in my judgment, is nothing short of reckless.

Let's be clear-eyed about what we are debating. This was not a negotiation with an honest government; it was a negotiation with terrorists who chant "death to America" and are responsible for more than a thousand American casualties in Iraq alone. If we allow this deal to go forward, we are putting the security of the world at grave risk.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our Nation's security and in defense of the free world, I cannot in good conscience support this agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to approve this agreement. After a thorough review process, I believe it is in the best national security interests of the United States and our allies for Congress to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

I have been a public official for nearly 23 years. This is the most consequential vote I have taken and the most difficult decision I have ever faced. I have spent the review period methodically going through the agreement, raising concerns with the administration, and speaking with independent sources, including nuclear nonproliferation experts, economists, and foreign ambassadors.

I also held a series of meetings and spoke with many constituents who fervently hold very strong and differing positions. My goal was to determine whether the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the most likely path to prevent Iran from achieving their nuclear weapons goals.

This agreement is clearly not perfect. It is one tool that we have to combat Iran's nuclear ambitions. Ultimately, my support is based on substance. Importantly, my Jewish identity and Jewish heart weighed heavily in my decisionmaking process.

As we listen to Iran's leaders call for the destruction of the Jewish people in Israel, history offers a brutal reminder of what happens when we do not listen.

Iran continues to be a leading state sponsor of terrorism, but an Iran with a nuclear weapon or Hezbollah or Hamas with a nuclear shield is far

more dangerous. With the JCPOA in place, we will have Iran's nuclear program under the most intrusive monitoring and inspection mechanisms in place, while we continue to combat Iran's terrorist reach.

I have personally spoken with the President and my colleagues about steps that we must and will take to continue strengthening Israel's and our other allies' intelligence and military capabilities. Opponents say we must press for a better deal, but after thoroughly investigating this prospect, I am left with no evidence that one is likely or even possible.

I heard directly from our allies, top diplomats, and analysts from across the political spectrum that the sanctions regime that we have in place now will erode, if not completely fall apart. Moreover, our partners will not come back to the negotiating table, and neither will Iran, and no one opposed to this deal has produced any evidence to the contrary.

I cannot comprehend why we would walk away from the safeguards in this agreement, leaving Iran speeding toward a nuclear weapon. Safeguards like 24/7/365 access, monitoring all of Iran's previously declared nuclear sites, eliminating 98 percent of Iran's highly enriched uranium stockpile, and the unprecedented standard of monitoring every stage of the nuclear supply chain.

Even if Iran cheats, we will know much more about their nuclear program, allowing us to more effectively eliminate it if that ever becomes necessary.

As a Jewish mother and as a Member of Congress, nothing is more important to me than ensuring the safety and security of the United States and Israel. I am confident that supporting this agreement is the best opportunity that we have to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have an expression in Judaism, may the United States go from strength to strength, and as we say in synagogue, the people of Israel live—am Yisrael chai.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran. Now, the President says it is a good deal; and you know what, he is right. It is a very good deal for Iran; but it is a very bad deal for America.

I fear, in his rush to try to build a legacy, the President has clearly given up far too much for far too little. He has done this at the expense of our security, as well as the security of our friend Israel and other U.S. allies.

Mr. Speaker, this is a deadly serious matter. The first thing the President does in his agreement with Iran is to give them some startup capital. An estimated \$120 billion held abroad will now be repatriated back to Iran's central bank, \$120 billion to a regime

whose Supreme Leader, to this day, calls for the annihilation of Israel, a regime that still chants "death to America," a regime that has put bounties on the heads of American soldiers and has the blood of American citizens on its hands, a regime whose sponsorship of Hezbollah has left our closest ally in the region, Israel, with 80,000 rockets trained on it.

In sum, it is a regime that simply represents the world's largest and most dangerous state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, President Obama would have us believe that waiving sanctions against this regime would make the world safer, but this is the very same President that dismissed the Islamic State as the JV team, and we see what that has gotten us.

This is simply not an administration whose assessment of national security threats is credible, and the stakes involved with a nuclear Iran leave zero room for error.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, I fear it is we who sent the JV team to negotiate with Iran. Sadly, they were outplayed, outmaneuvered, and outwitted; and the result of their failure is the dangerous agreement we have before us today.

It is such a flawed agreement that the President, yet again, tells Congress we have to pass something to actually find out what is in it. In other words, the President has utterly failed to provide the secret side agreements.

President Obama once told us we cannot allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon, but under his deal, Iran's nuclear program will not be dismantled, only temporarily slowed, and that is if the Iranians don't cheat; but the President's team has failed to achieve anytime, anywhere inspections. Thus, it will be impossible to ensure the Iranians aren't cheating.

Ah, but don't worry, Mr. Speaker, we are told the Iranians will turn themselves in if they cheat—really? In short, the President's agreement rewards Iran's terrorist-sponsoring regime with billions of dollars in relief without any guarantee of compliance.

When you look at the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't trust this administration. I don't trust the Iranians. Why would we ever trust the two together? For the sake of our national security, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this flawed, dangerous agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic nuclear agreement reached by the United States and our negotiating partners with Iran. For the sake of our national security and that of our allies, we must seize this unique opportunity.

In the midst of all these wild charges, let's just try to get some perspective. In fact, this agreement goes far beyond any negotiated nuclear deal in history.

□ 1815

It will reduce Iran's stockpiled uranium by nearly 98 percent; it will per-

manently prevent the plutonium pathway to a nuclear weapon at Arak; it will disable and mothball two-thirds of Iran's enrichment centrifuges, including more advanced models; it will terminate all enrichment at Fordow; and it will provide for intrusive inspections of nuclear sites in perpetuity.

This is an unprecedented degrading—not just a freezing, a massive degrading—of Iran's nuclear program. No military strike or strikes could achieve as much.

I challenge any of the agreement's detractors to present a viable alternative that achieves the same result and will verifiably prevent a nuclear-armed Iran for the foreseeable future. They won't—and they haven't—because they can't. There simply isn't a viable diplomatic or military alternative for preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

The notion that we could somehow unilaterally reject the agreement and still compel the P5+1 to resume negotiations is pure fantasy. Our international partners have made clear that reinstating the effective sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table would be impossible. For Congress to scuttle the deal would destroy our credibility as a negotiating party and would very likely put Iran right back on the path to developing a weapon.

The stakes couldn't be higher. The nuclear issue should transcend political opportunism and partisan rancor. We should be working together across party lines to ensure the swift and effective implementation of the JCPOA. We should be exploring ways that we can enhance cooperative efforts with Israel and the international community to address Iran's support for Hezbollah and its gross abuse of human rights as well as other critical challenges in the Middle East.

Today, we can start down that path by supporting the agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from the Foreign Affairs Committee for his leadership on this work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to this legislation that would clear the way for the President's misguided deal with Iran.

The United States must continue to stand between Iran and nuclear weapons capability, but instead, the deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear achievements and strengthens its extremist regime.

The agreement gradually removes the key barriers that prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons capabilities, from growing its economic influence in the Middle East, and from continuing its state funding of terrorist organizations that threaten the security of the country and the well-being of our allies.

This deal lifts critical economic sanctions that have limited Iran's

scope of influence in the region, removes the arms embargo, and lifts missile program restrictions.

For these reasons, I oppose the President's deal and urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement should be judged on what is best for our national security and what is more likely to produce peace. I believe that peace has a better chance if we reject this deal, keep sanctions on, and go back to the negotiating table to get a better agreement.

This agreement was supposed to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, but, at best, Iran will be a nuclear threshold state in 15 years. By practically guaranteeing and legitimizing this access, there will be a rush by others in the region to gain their own nuclear weapons, creating an enormously dangerous arms race in the most volatile part of the world.

The inspections protocols in the agreement are troubling because they give Iran 24 days to delay inspection requests at suspected nuclear sites, a far cry from "anytime, anywhere." And the agreement contains deeply concerning sanctions relief on Iran's acquisition of conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology in 5 and 8 years, respectively.

These are just some of my concerns that lead me, after careful consideration, to oppose this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we should and we can do better. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for all of their hard work.

The fact that we are even debating whether to enter into this agreement is very troubling.

Let's be clear what we are talking about. The United States of America is going to enter into a deal with a rogue nation who refuses to release the four Americans they are holding, who has cheated on every deal they have been party to over the past 30 years, who is a party to secret deals we cannot see, who calls all of us the Great Satan, who calls for death to our citizens and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. And we are told the deal is necessary because the United States of America has no other option.

Has it really come to this? We have options. One option is a better deal, and a better deal looks like this: release the four Americans, no sunset clause, and inspections just like we were promised—anytime, anywhere. And if these terms are unacceptable to Iran, then the United States of Amer-

ica will use all of its economic might to put tough sanctions back in place.

If we do this deal, let's look at what the next 25 years looks like.

Immediately, in the next 12 months, Iran will get their hands on \$50 billion to \$150 billion. The money will not be used for their citizens. It will be used to perpetuate terror around the world. Iran will get its money; we won't get our four Americans.

Over the next 12 months, they will start to cheat and they will get a bomb or two. Over the next 12 months, we are going to start an arms race in the Middle East. Over the next 1 to 5 years, we will try and snap back sanctions, but that will be ineffective because all the long-term contracts will be grandfathered in.

In 5 years, Iran will be buying conventional weapons. In 8 years, they will have a ballistic missile. In 10 years, because of their cheating, they will have a ballistic missile with a nuclear bomb pointed at the United States of America. And in 25 years, our friend and ally Israel may not exist.

I was in business for 30 years before I got here, and the one thing I knew is you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

We cannot do this deal with Iran.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution of approval of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Throughout this debate, there have been accusations questioning the motives and loyalties of Members in making this decision. It is precisely because I believe this agreement is in the interest of the United States and because I have been a strong supporter of Israel my entire life that I am supporting the Iran nuclear agreement.

This must not be a vote of politics but of conscience. I, for one, could not live with myself if I voted in a way that I believe would put the lives of Americans and Israelis at greater risk of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

My priority and overriding objective in assessing this agreement has been to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb. The interests of the United States and of Israel in this respect are identical. In addition to constituting an existential threat to Israel, a nuclear-armed Iran would make Iran's conventional threats more dangerous and difficult to counter and pose a greater danger to the United States, to the region, and to the world.

The question before us is not whether this is a good deal. The question is which of the two options available to us—supporting or rejecting the deal—is more likely to avert a nuclear-armed Iran. I have concluded, after examining all the arguments, that supporting the Iran nuclear agreement gives us the better chance of preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The agreement will shut Iran's pathways to developing the necessary fis-

sionable material for a nuclear bomb for at least 15 years. The inspection and verification procedures against illicit plutonium production or uranium enrichment are airtight.

The questions that have been raised about inspection procedures—the so-called side deals, the alleged self-inspection—do not relate to the central issue of production of fissionable material. And without fissionable material, you cannot make a bomb.

Even after 15 years, when some of the restrictions will be eased, we would still know instantly about any attempt to make bomb materials because the inspectors and the electronic and photographic surveillance will still be there. The options available to a future President for stopping Iran then would be better than the options available now if the deal is rejected because we would have more access, instant intelligence, and more knowledge of the Iranian program.

The argument that if we reject the deal, we can force Iran back to the negotiating table and obtain a better deal is a fantasy. It is not a viable alternative. The other countries that have joined us in multilateral sanctions against Iran have made it clear that they will drop their sanctions if we reject the deal; and American sanctions, by themselves, have been proven ineffective in coercing Iran.

We must be very clear that, if necessary, the United States will use military force to prevent an Iranian nuclear bomb; but the odds of that being necessary are significantly less with approval of this deal than with rejection of the agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. Going forward, it remains vital that we continue to pursue ways to further guarantee the security of the United States, of Israel, and of our other allies in the Middle East. This will require strict and diligent oversight of the implementation of the agreement, maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge, and countering Iran's support for terrorism and other destabilizing conduct.

We must be ready to take action against Iran's nefarious behavior, and Iran must know that the United States will never allow it to pose a nuclear threat to the region and the world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), chairman of the Committee on Ethics.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and the underlying Iran nuclear agreement.

Despite entering into these negotiations from a position of strength—that would be the United States—the deal before us fails to achieve the goal of preventing Iran's capacity to develop a nuclear weapon. It simply contains or manages Iran's nuclear program.

By agreeing to a lax enforcement and inspections regime and fanciful, unrealistic snapback sanctions, the administration has accepted that Iran should remain 1 year away from a nuclear bomb. I am not prepared to accept that. The sanctions relief will provide Iran with billions of dollars of funds that will bolster the Revolutionary Guard and nonstate militant groups. The deal ends the conventional arms embargo and the prohibition on ballistic missile technology. Not only will this result in conventional arms flowing to groups like Hezbollah, it concedes the delivery system for a nuclear bomb.

This agreement will provide Iran with nuclear infrastructure, a missile delivery system, and the funds to pay for it all. And, by the way, the I in ICBM means "intercontinental." I don't believe that New Zealand and Mexico are the intended targets. That would be us.

This deal cripples and shatters the current notion of nuclear nonproliferation. If Iran can enrich uranium, which they can under this agreement, their Gulf Arab neighbors will likely want to do the same.

I do not want a nuclear arms race, a nuclearized Middle East, a region of state instability in irrational nonstate actors. Someone explain to me how deterrence works under that scenario. We should not reward the ayatollahs with billions of dollars and sophisticated weapons in exchange for temporary and unenforceable nuclear restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a diplomatic resolution to the Iran nuclear issue, but this is a dangerously weak agreement. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

□ 1830

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 and Iran. The deal fails to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It fails to guarantee intrusive enough inspections to ensure that Iran does not cheat, it fails to keep Iran from achieving nuclear threshold status, and it rewards Iran's horrific behavior.

In the initial phase of this agreement, Iran would quickly receive a whopping sanctions relief package potentially totaling \$150 billion. We all know that Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and that this money will embolden a regime openly committed to confronting the United States and destabilizing the Middle East.

In 8 years, Iran legally begins expanding its ballistic missile program and continues expanding its intercontinental ballistic missile program under the guise of satellite testing.

And who do we think these missiles are aimed at?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. VARGAS. As recently as yesterday, Ayatollah Khamenei declared: "I am saying to Israel that they would not live to see the end of these 25 years. There will be no such thing as a Zionist regime in 25 years."

This is a bad deal, and we should reject it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the approval process that is going on and the underlying deal with Iran. It is one of the most consequential foreign policy issues that we will confront, certainly since I have been here and, I expect, for the next several decades.

This is a terrible deal. I can't state it any more forcefully.

We have seen this movie before. In 1994, President Bill Clinton made a deal with North Korea. His deal with North Korea would rid the Korean Peninsula of nuclear weapons and would usher North Korea onto the stage as a responsible citizen of the world's nations. That didn't happen. This is the exact same verbiage we heard on this floor then that is being said tonight, and this is the exact same outcome we will get with Iran and their nuclear program.

Look at their current record. Chief sponsor of state terrorism around the world. As their economy improves with the dropping of the sanctions and the resources they will get, do you realistically think that this ayatollah will, in fact, become a moderate voice within his country?

Do you not think he will take those resources and expand the mischief and terror that he has conducted around the world already under the sanctions that were in place?

The other side has already given up on the snapback provisions. They have argued very eloquently that those won't happen because we can't reinforce the sanctions that were the heart of what got Iran at the table today.

Mr. Speaker, this deal ushers in a world that is less safe, less stable, and less secure.

Trust must be earned. I trust Iran's word when they say that Israel must go away. I trust Iran when they say "death to America." I do not trust Iran when they say they will abide by this agreement.

I wouldn't play golf with these people because golf is one of those events where you have to self-assess your penalties. They will not do that in playing golf, and they are not about to do it with respect to this nuclear program that is going on.

We have no way of knowing what their covert activities might be over the next several years. They will cheat. They have cheated, and they will continue to cheat. We cannot trust these people with a deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion of approval and reject this deal. Tell the world where we stand. Whether our partners around the world can see the clear-eyed threat that these folks represent to the world for the next several decades, we can see it, and we must vote "no."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 64, which disapproves of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by the P5+1.

I reviewed the agreement thoroughly, participated in classified briefings, and listened to the many details and intricacies present by the nuclear and security experts on all sides. This agreement may not be perfect, but it is the most viable option we have in reducing Iran's capability of acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA prolongs Iran's nuclear weapon breakout time, reduces their number of operating centrifuges, and decreases Iran's current stockpile of low enriched uranium.

More importantly, the agreement allows the International Atomic Energy Agency the ability to access and inspect Iran to verify and ensure compliance.

Should Iran cheat, the international community will come together and once again reimpose the sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

In every situation that involves the possibility of using military force to overcome a threat, I will always side with exploring and exhausting every possible avenue towards a diplomatic resolution first.

I support the JCPOA because it provides a reasonable, balanced, and diplomatic solution rather than a worst-case scenario.

In closing, with the support of 36 retired generals and admirals and 29 of the Nation's top scientists, I am confident we are on the right track with this plan. All of these highly distinguished and experienced leaders agree that this agreement is the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chair of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. A chief reason for this opposition is important, yet simple: The Iran nuclear deal doesn't make America safer, it doesn't make Israel safer, and it doesn't make the rest of the world safer either.

Whatever your thoughts on this Iran nuclear deal, we should all be able to agree, the world will be a much more dangerous and unstable place if Iran were to obtain a nuclear weapon. Unfortunately, the deal the President negotiated won't stop that from happening.

Instead, under this deal, Iran gets to keep its nuclear facilities. Amazingly, it will be allowed to self-police those facilities and report directly to the IAEA, an idea that would be laughable if it were not so crazy.

Iran will get to enrich uranium, all while receiving sanctions relief to the tune of \$150 billion—\$150 billion pumped into a \$400 billion a year national economy; \$150 billion that will no doubt be used by Iran to bankroll terrorist organizations, further destabilize the Middle East, and continue their work to wipe Israel off the map.

It was Ronald Reagan who said “trust but verify” during arms control negotiations with Communist Russia more than a generation ago, but it seems the Obama administration is asking us to trust Iran and then trust some more. Well, I'm not willing to do that, and the American people aren't willing to do that either.

We need to stop this bad deal before it is too late and negotiate a better deal, a deal that stops Iran's nuclear program and ensures the safety of America, Israel, and the rest of the world now and into the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and against the resolution—well, actually, in favor of the resolution of approval.

I must say, in starting, we are at a paradoxical moment. The fears, the haunting specter, a terrible thing, the existential threats posed by a nuclear Iran are all legitimate fears and legitimate haunting specters, regional hegemony to be avoided.

But ironically, those concerns and those fears and those outcomes raised by my friends on the other side of the aisle and the opponents of this agreement actually come true and are realized if we do what they want us to do, which is to reject this agreement.

The alternative to this agreement is an opaque, unconstrained Iranian nuclear program, Mr. Speaker, hanging like the sword of Damocles over all of our heads. And the security of the United States and Israel and regional partners, who knows?

The false hope offered by the critics is let's return to the negotiating table to seek a better deal. A man that I respect, at one of our hearings that Chairman ED ROYCE chaired on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, former Senator Joe Lieberman, said just that.

I said: How did that work? He said: Well, let's just go back to the partners

and Iran and say, we just couldn't sell it; let's start over.

The proposition that we would renounce our own agreement that we negotiated, wrought by more than a year of tough negotiations, and expect that our negotiating partners, including Russia and China and, of course, Iran itself, would sit back down at the table and start all over again under our leadership is specious, if not delusional, as an argument.

We cannot be naive about the scenario in which Congress rejects this agreement brokered by our own country. Among our allies, we divest ourselves of the goodwill that undergirded these negotiations; and among our adversaries, we would confirm their suspicion we cannot be trusted.

The international sanctions regime that drove Iran to the negotiating table would collapse, and our diplomatic leverage would be diminished in all future U.S.-led negotiations.

Most concerning of all, we would return, once again, to the situation we are at, one of deep anxiety and uncertainty regarding Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Critics of the agreement have offered no alternative and have tried to define that agreement by what it is not. It is not a perfect deal that dismantles every nut and bolt of the Iranian nuclear development program, peaceful or otherwise.

It is not a comprehensive resolution of the entire relationship and the myriad issues the U.S. and our allies have with the repressive regime in Tehran and its reprehensible support for terrorist insurgencies in the region. No one ever said it would be.

What arms control agreement in the history of our country has ever attempted to circumscribe every aspect of a relationship with an adversary?

And certainly not this one. In other words, this agreement is the diplomatic alternative we sought to attain when we entered into these very negotiations.

The deal adheres to the high standards of verification, transparency, and compliance on which any acceptable agreement with Iran must be founded. That isn't just my word. That is what former Republican Secretary of State Colin Powell says. That is what Republican former NSC Adviser Brent Scowcroft says. That is what former Republican Senator John Warner from my State says.

The agreement erects an unprecedented and intrusive inspection regime that provides the IAEA with access to declared nuclear facilities and suspected covert nuclear development sites.

Additionally, they will be able to monitor Iran's entire nuclear program supply chain, including uranium mines, mills, centrifuges, rotors, bellows production, storage facilities, and dedicated procurement for nuclear-related or dual-use materials technology.

The agreement also rolls back major components and places strict restric-

tions on the Iranian nuclear program. If these restrictions are not adhered to, the United States can, at any time, unilaterally revive the sanctions currently in place.

Congress should immediately begin to conduct close oversight to ensure those terms are implemented and that Iran is living up to its obligations.

This isn't about trust. It was Ronald Reagan who said “trust, but verify.” Former Secretary of State Clinton today kind of echoed those words, saying “distrust and verify,” and that is why she supports the agreement. It does just that.

More broadly, the United States must signal to Iran that its condemnable record on human rights, terrorism, and regional subversion will not be tolerated; nor will we hide, with this agreement, that action and our response to it. In fact, quite the opposite. We will redouble our efforts to stop them in that egregious behavior.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, in closing, article I, section 8, clause 11, of the Constitution vests Congress with the duty to authorize war.

Implicit in that text is Congress' additional responsibility to exhaust all reasonable alternatives before committing the American people and our men and women in uniform to such a fateful path.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action represents our best endeavor to provide just that alternative. It is the product of earnest diplomacy. Congress should put aside partisanship and support it for the sake of our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, several Members spoke of Iran's commitments under this agreement. While it is true that Iran has committed to taking certain steps under the agreement, it is also true that Iranians have never complied with any agreement related to its weapons program.

So let's start with considering what Iran's leaders have been saying today about this agreement. This is what they say. They say that Iran can pursue the development of missiles without any restrictions. How can that be, given what is in this agreement?

Well, President Rouhani—the supposed moderate here—has argued repeatedly that the only restrictions on Iran's missile developments are in the U.N. Security Council resolution.

Endorsing the deal, he says, it is not in the agreement itself. They don't recognize the Security Council resolution. So he says: We are not restricted by this agreement. So what the gentleman is quoting, they say they are not restricted by that.

Mr. Speaker, Iranian leaders say that Iran can violate the U.N. Security Council resolutions without violating the agreement. Sanctions do not, therefore, snap back if Iran violates

the U.N. Security Council resolutions, according to Iran, and that Iran intends to violate the U.N. Security Council restrictions on weapons sales and on imports.

This is President Rouhani again:

We will sell and buy weapons whenever and wherever we deem it necessary. We will not wait for permission from anyone or any resolution.

So Iran's defense minister has said that Iran is negotiating right now to purchase Russian fighter jets. We know they are negotiating in terms of ballistic missiles right now. They are in violation of the agreement, yet we don't see any intention to enforce that.

So we have got to ask ourselves: Just what kind of agreement is this? Who is this agreement with?

As the committee heard yesterday, it is an agreement with a regime whose world view was founded in large part on a fiery theological anti-Americanism and a view of Americanism as Satanism.

I don't have to tell the Members here. I mean, they hear it every week, those of you that are watching what is coming out of Iran "death to America" every week.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement gives up too much too fast with not enough in return, and we have to judge it on the long-term national security interests of the United States.

Does it make the region and the world more safe, secure, stable? In my mind, clearly it does not. So I don't feel this is worthy of the House's support.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to the so-called Iran nuclear accord. I do so for all the reasons that have been well-articulated over the last couple of hours.

But I also do so based simply on the reason of history. And it is a history that is actually shared with the chairman, in that we were here together in the 1990s.

Then-President Clinton at that time met with North Korea. They formed an accord that basically said: We will give you benefits now for the promise of becoming a responsible member of the world community going forward. The benefits went and accrued to North Korea. The responsible membership in the world community never came.

In that regard, though, the President is certainly well-intended in his efforts. This promise will prove as real as this notion of, if you like your health insurance, you can keep it.

His intentions were good in that regard, with regard to providing health insurance, but it just didn't pan out. I don't think it will be any different in this particular deal.

In that regard, I think it is important to think about what neighbors think of neighbors. In this case, it is important to look at what the Prime Minister of Israel has said in that he believes this is a mistake of "historic proportions."

I think in many ways it mirrors what we saw in 1938. At that point, Neville Chamberlain negotiated with Hitler and gave away Czechoslovakia in the process.

But there in the Munich accords there was this promise of peace, lasting peace in our time. The peace lasted less than a year, and it did not materialize.

I think that the saying is that those who don't learn from history are destined to repeat it.

I think we would be very well-advised to look at the recent history of the 1990s in the North Korea deal, the history of the 1930s, and a whole lot of history across the last 1,000 years that say trading off peace for security is never something that works so well.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from New York, I would simply say I think that last analogy is invidious.

The history of World War II is the fact that people ignored warnings for so long that, by the time Munich happened, it most certainly was appeasement.

What should have happened was active engagement to preclude that ever happening. That is precisely what this administration has done.

It will prevent a Munich. It will prevent appeasement. It will provide the dynamic engagement we need to prevent a nuclear Iran.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King once said, "On some positions, Cowardice asks the question, 'Is it safe?' Expediency asks the question, 'Is it politic?' Vanity asks the question, 'Is it popular?' But Conscience asks the question, 'Is it right?' And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because one's conscience tells one that it is right."

I have often reflected on those words when faced with tough decisions.

Today's vote on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is one of the most consequential votes we will take as Members of Congress.

My support for the Iran agreement is about doing what is right for America, our allies, and the world. It is, indeed, a matter of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, since the conclusion of the agreement, I have traveled to 10 nations and vetted this deal from every angle I could think of so that, at this moment of decision, I could act without reservation and with full understanding.

As I listen to this debate, I am deeply disheartened that we are not adequately weighing the realities of our globalized world.

After years of effort toward a more unified approach to addressing Iran's nuclear ambitions, key partners in the Middle East region and most of our allies consider the Iran agreement as an

important next step in diplomatic efforts.

Former U.S. ambassadors; former Israeli military; former U.S. Secretaries of State, including Colin Powell; and so many others from an array of vantage points have expressed support for this landmark deal, as have over 100 nations.

We should not ignore the considered judgment of scientists, security experts, renowned diplomats, and our allies. The consensus is that this is a good deal.

Now, some of my colleagues believe that, despite the risk, rejecting this deal can lead to a better deal down the road. Others oppose the deal out of reckless political gamesmanship.

But what has become clear to me in my assessment of the risks involved in supporting or rejecting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is that, if Congress derails this deal, history will record such act as a monumental mistake and the alternatives would not change Iranian nuclear and weaponization pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting the plan and resorting to unilateral sanctions would prove futile, as it has in the past, while relying on military action would not curb Iran's ambitions or erase its technical knowledge.

Critics also assert that this deal does not address concerns about issues with Iran that are outside the scope of the plan. We know from past experience that reaching an agreement on one critical issue does not preclude us from working on other serious concerns by other means.

We negotiated with the Soviet Union during Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, which took place in the midst of the Vietnam war that was waged against us with Soviet-made arms, yet those agreements lessened the danger of nuclear confrontation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has shown tremendous leadership on the world stage by choosing diplomacy first. Leadership is never easy. By definition, it is a lonely and sometimes an unpopular exercise.

Today we must show leadership, we must display fortitude, and do what is right. And what is right in this scenario is that we support the Iran agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, this deal is a capitulation by the greatest nation in the world to the most rogue nation in the world.

What makes the deal so bad is that Iran doesn't even have to cheat to emerge in 10 or 15 years with an industrial-sized nuclear program and with little or no breakout time to achieve nuclear weapons capabilities.

By lifting the financial sanctions, we are literally financing the very weapons and terror that will be directed at us and our allies by the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world today.

Amazingly, we are abandoning the arms embargo and the ballistic missile embargo against Iran for good measure.

Not only is our national security threatened, but our close ally, Israel, fears for its very existence under this deal. We simply cannot abandon Israel.

Let history record that I stand against this weak and dangerous deal with a regime that hates the U.S. and hates Israel.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution approving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the nuclear program of Iran negotiated by the Obama administration in concert with five other nations, the P5+1.

I want to commend President Obama's Secretary Kerry, Under Secretary Sherman, Secretary Moniz, and their teams for their leadership and continued, persistent engagement with our international partners and Members of Congress to make this moment possible.

None of us comes to this decision lightly. It is perhaps the most important decision of our public life, no matter what decision we come to.

But after reading the agreement and the classified and unclassified underlying documents, taking part in numerous briefings at the White House and here on Capitol Hill, meeting with constituents, and studying the analyses of experts, I am confident that this strong diplomatic achievement provides the only option that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and, by some estimates, in as few as 2 to 3 months. This is not achieved by trust, Mr. Speaker, but through verification.

Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of continuous military engagement for our armed services, this agreement cuts off all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon and does so without unnecessarily risking American lives in yet another military action, even as the agreement preserves that ultimate option, should it become necessary in the event of Iran's default.

This agreement sends a clear message to Iran that the global community stands united today and well into the future in ensuring that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon.

Much has been said of Iran's capacity after 10 to 15 years. And even there, the agreement places Iran in the confines of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty, just as the rest of us are.

If Iran violates the agreement, they will, without question, face complete isolation, even more severe repercussions, and the U.S. retains our ability to engage unilateral sanctions and our military option.

It is true that this agreement is not perfect. But if this agreement does not

go forward, there is no better deal, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there is no deal. No sanctions, no international partners, no inspections, no deal. This is a negotiation which is, by definition, not perfect.

□ 1900

It is my hope that we will divorce ourselves from the hyperbole and the rhetoric in favor of the seriousness this issue deserves. I have concluded that the agreement is the best path forward.

This is not just my considered judgment; it is the judgment of the highest levels of the military, nonproliferation experts, nuclear scientists, and our diplomatic partners who join in their overwhelming support of the agreement.

As a Congress, we can only do our best and our part to move forward to provide the necessary resources for proper oversight to ensure effective monitoring and aggressive verification. If Iran cheats, we will know it; we will know it quickly, and we will act decisively.

Once again, the world turned to the United States for our leadership on dealing with Iran and its nuclear program. This agreement, reached through rigorous diplomacy, in conjunction with our partners, provides the tools we need to ensure a pathway to peace and security for the United States, for Israel, the region, and the world.

I will vote to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note that over 200 retired generals, flag officers, and admirals signed a letter in opposition; and we have heard continuously, including this week, from retired generals, officers, and admirals about their concerns about this agreement.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the votes this week on the President's nuclear deal with Iran are some of the most important we have taken in years. As the world's largest sponsor of terror, Iran continues to play an enormously destructive and destabilizing role in the world.

Iran's actions are destroying the lives of millions of vulnerable innocents. The current refugee crisis in the Middle East and Europe is only the most recent example.

Iran has been propping up Assad's regime in Syria for the past 4 years, sending weapons and thousands of fighters there to brutalize the Syrian people. ISIS has exploited these conditions, and now, millions of Syrians have been displaced, many of them going to unimaginable lengths to seek refuge in Europe. Iran bears responsibility for this.

This deal is not reform. This deal is incentivizing bad behavior. A vote in favor of this deal is a vote that favors

party politics over the will of the American people and global security. It is a terrible way to do business.

The American people deserve full transparency from the White House on this deal, as required by the law and even basic respect for American voters.

The President is required to turn over all the agreements—even the side deals made with third parties—and he has yet to do that.

While I was home the last few weeks in my district in eastern Washington, not a day passed that I didn't hear grave concerns about this deal. It wasn't Republicans versus Democrats, liberals versus conservatives; it wasn't anti-President Obama. People are sincerely worried about what this deal means for our safety and security.

We were told by the administration early on that no deal was better than a bad deal. Now, the President claims it is either this deal or war.

Mr. Speaker, we aren't asking the President to stop his efforts to reach an agreement with Iran. We need a better deal. We are asking the President to continue and strengthen his efforts so that we get a deal that, first, truly denies Iran a path to a nuclear weapon by dismantling its extensive infrastructure; second, includes a robust inspections process, not one that is conducted by Iran itself; and, third, compels Iran to cease its support of terrorist organizations and brutal dictators like Assad, whose actions are destabilizing the entire region, as well as Europe.

Until this deal includes, at a minimum, these three components and the President has made his obligations under the law, I will continue to oppose it, and I will urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Let's send the President back to the negotiating table.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Maybe the President could get some advice from the leadership of the Republican Conference in how to figure out what resolution to bring to the floor.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is whether or not this body will approve the negotiated agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. It is one of the most consequential issues of our time and requires serious and sober consideration by every single Member of this body.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that in a matter of such gravity involving the foreign affairs of our Nation and the safety and security of our allies, particularly Israel, we could set aside urges to score political points and avoid dangerous hyperbole and instead debate the merits of this agreement.

I regret that the process for considering this agreement has sometimes devolved into a sad show of partisanship. Our Nation is better than this.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of President Kennedy's inaugural address, which he delivered from the east front of the Capitol, just a few hundred feet from this Chamber. Addressing the threat from the Soviet Union, President Kennedy said: "Let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness."

He went on to say: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Those words still ring true today. This agreement shows the power of diplomacy to advance our national security interests and ensures that, before being required to send our brave men and women into a dangerous military conflict, that we have had the courage to exhaust every possible alternative.

Like all of my colleagues, I have spent the last 2 months carefully studying the terms of this agreement that the United States and our negotiating partners reached to prevent a nuclear Iran; meeting with military, scientific, and nonproliferation experts; participating in dozens of classified briefings and committee hearings; meeting with the President and members of his administration, as well as meeting with my constituents.

After a great deal of serious deliberation, I believe that the United States and the world are safer with this deal in place than without it.

I fully recognize that this agreement is not perfect—far from it—but like any decision in life, we have to confront the choices we face, not the one we would rather have before us or like to imagine.

I believe approval of this agreement is the most responsible and effective way to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. By its very terms, it affirms that under no circumstance will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider what we will be giving up if we reject this deal. This agreement requires Iran to submit to the most intrusive and rigorous inspections regimen ever negotiated. This is in stark contrast to the complete lack of access currently available to the international community to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

If Congress rejects the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, it will mean zero restrictions on Iran's nuclear ambitions, no limitations on their enrichment activities or centrifuge production, and no ability for international inspectors to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

Many experts agree that rejection of this agreement would mean Iran could develop a nuclear weapon in just a matter of months, the worst possible outcome.

Approval of this agreement does not end our responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Congress must work closely with the administration to ensure that we take additional steps to mitigate the risks reflected in the agreement, to discour-

age Iran from escalating its destabilizing activities in the region, and to enhance the likelihood that Iran complies with all the terms of the agreement.

Additional resources have to be devoted to supporting, monitoring, verification, and intelligence gathering activities.

Above all else, we must make it absolutely clear to Iran that any violation of the agreement will be met with swift and decisive action by the United States and the international community.

I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make certain that all of this happens.

In the end, this was not an easy decision or one I arrived at quickly. There is risk in accepting this agreement, and it contains real tradeoffs. No responsible person should claim otherwise.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that rejecting this agreement would present even greater and more dangerous risks to our national security and our allies than the risks associated with going forward. Because of this, I intend to support the resolution of approval and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers included in the preamble of the United States Constitution the intention of our government to provide for the common defense. Protecting and defending our Nation was not an afterthought; it was a first thought.

The defense of America and our allies has always been a strategic and moral goal. The agreement we have before us today, however, primarily meets Iran's goals. Sanctions are lifted; nuclear research and development continues, and America's safety is compromised. Under this deal, in a matter of years—likely in our lifetimes, but certainly in the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren—Iran will have a bomb.

The President of the United States has said that this agreement is not based on trust, but on verification. I wish that was true because this agreement shouldn't be based on trust. I certainly do not trust a government that has acted as a bank for terrorists.

Any agreement should be based on verification; but where is the simple assurance of anytime, anywhere inspections? We don't have verification. What we have is misplaced hope, hope that Iran has disclosed all of its past nuclear activities, hope that Iran will be transparent, hope that Iran has somehow changed.

Earlier this year, 367 bipartisan Members of Congress sent a letter to the President outlining several conditions that any final nuclear agreement

must address. Unfortunately, the agreement we have before us does not meet congressional standards and has numerous fatal flaws.

For example, in 2012, Congress barred Iranians from coming here to study nuclear science and nuclear engineering at U.S. universities. One would think that is a good policy, given that they are seeking to get a bomb.

In one of the most outrageous provisions of this deal, the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of State will no longer be allowed to enforce the bar. This deal will actually make the U.S. an accomplice to Iran's nuclear weapons program by granting Iranians the ability to come to the U.S. to acquire knowledge instrumental in their being able to design and build nuclear bombs.

Other concerns include giving Iran a signing bonus, lifting the arms embargo, failure to cut off Iran's pathway to the bomb, and the lack of protection for not only our own safety, but for the safety of the world. A nuclear Iran is a threat to our great ally, Israel, but is also a threat to the rest of the Middle East, America, and the world.

While the administration has said that any deal is better than no deal, Thomas Jefferson once said, "Delay is preferable to error," and I agree with Jefferson.

Had our negotiators remained at the table a while longer, perhaps we would not be where we are today; yet, as it stands, this so-called deal, if it goes through, will likely mark the pages of history as a great error.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am reminded back to Churchill. He said it is always better to jaw-jaw than to war-war.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY for yielding me time and, really, for your tremendous leadership on this very vital issue. Also, I must salute our Leader PELOSI for her unwavering support and hard work for global peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3461, a resolution to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Now, in the last two Congresses, mind you, I introduced the Prevent Iran from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons and Stop War Through Diplomacy Act, which called for the appointment of a high-level special envoy to address Iran's nuclear program and an end to the no-contact policy between our diplomats.

Since the 1970s, quite frankly, I have worked on many nuclear nonproliferation issues and believe very strongly that the deal that President Obama and our P5+1 partners negotiated demonstrates how effective diplomacy can be. It will lead us closer to a world where our children and future generations can live without the fear of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA, supported by the majority of Americans and key international allies, including France, Germany, and Britain, though not perfect, it is the best way to prevent Iran from ever acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The Iran nuclear deal puts into place the most intrusive inspection system, including a 24/7 surveillance of Iran's enrichment facilities and reactors; it cuts off all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon, and it will enhance regional and global security.

□ 1915

United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent political op-ed: "If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door No. 2, no do-over, no rewrite of the deal on the table."

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners. It will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran. Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate its weapons programs with no oversight. That is unacceptable. We cannot afford the alternative to this deal.

This is a defining moment for our country and for our world. Let us continue to work for peace. We all know that the military option is always there. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and against this disastrous nuclear agreement with Iran.

The actions that Iran will be allowed to pursue under this agreement are a direct threat to the United States and to our allies, and it falls far short of the commitment the President made to the American people, which is to verifiably prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Under the deal, Iran will maintain a robust nuclear infrastructure. They will be able to conduct research on advanced centrifuges that are capable of rapidly enriching uranium and developing ballistic missiles that are capable of carrying a bomb to Israel, Europe, or the United States. Instead of anytime, anywhere inspections, the bureaucratic process ensures lengthy delays, which will allow Iran to cover its tracks.

This troubling deal will provide billions of dollars to fund Iran's international terror enterprise even as they call for Israel's annihilation and chant "death to America."

It is time to lead the world to a better deal that will result in Iran's forever abandoning its threats to the world.

Mr. Speaker, while this House actually votes on the merits of this deal, I know what happened today in the other House of Congress—the Senate.

There, almost all Democrats have joined to block a vote on this deal. One Democrat who wanted to vote was Senator SCHUMER of New York. Senator SCHUMER released a statement last month that showed he understands the serious defects of this deal—from the inadequate inspections to the billions that will flow into Iran's terror enterprise. Because of these defects, Senator SCHUMER concluded, we will be worse off with this agreement than without it.

But there is another choice, Mr. Speaker—a better deal—one negotiated with a clear understanding of the nature of our enemy.

I ask my colleagues to reject this deal, to encourage the President to go back to the negotiating table, and to vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it was John Kennedy who negotiated the first nuclear Test Ban Treaty successfully with our archenemy that threatened to bury us—the Soviet Union. He said that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the P5+1 nuclear agreement with Iran, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Like my vote against the Iraq war, this decision is one of the most important foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress.

The intent of sanctions and negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase the transparency of their nuclear activities. It is clear to me, as well as to numerous nuclear, diplomatic, and national security experts around the globe, that this agreement achieves these critical goals.

It not only cuts off all pathways to a nuclear weapon, but it also imposes unprecedented and permanent inspections, and it ensures we can automatically reinstate international sanctions if Iran violates the agreement.

In contrast, defeating this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent.

Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our Nation and our allies, including Israel.

While the risks of a nuclear-armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending American troops into harm's way. This is, undeniably, one of those decisions. Under this agreement, every option is and will remain on the

table, including that of military force; but we have a solemn obligation to ensure that every diplomatic avenue is exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq war and why I support this nuclear deal with Iran.

This deal has certainly not been perfect, but perfect is not and never has been an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative, yet no such alternative has been put forward. This agreement before us is the best path available. It has my full support.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, when the President was running for reelection, he said: Look, with Iran, it is very simple. We will remove the sanctions when they dismantle and give up their nuclear program.

That was a promise he made to the American people, but this deal doesn't even come close to that. Iran is allowed to maintain a vast, vast nuclear infrastructure.

Two years ago in this House, we passed more robust sanctions, which would have further tightened the screws on the Iranian regime. I think, at that time, Iran desperately wanted to get out of the sanctions. If you had asked Iran what they wanted, they would have, obviously, wanted the sanctions relief because they needed the money—the regime needed it to solidify themselves in power—but they also would have wanted to keep their nuclear program. Then, of course, they would have wanted to continue to fund terrorism.

This agreement basically gives Iran everything it wants, so I join my colleagues who have urged that we resoundingly reject this agreement.

I want to point out something that, I think, is very personal to a lot of veterans.

If you look right here, this is an up-armored Humvee in Iraq in, probably, the 2007–2008 time period. It has been ripped to shreds by an EFP device—an explosively formed penetrator. This is something wherein the explosion will cause these pieces of metal to go 3,000 meters per second. It will ravage the individuals who are in the Humvee, and it will even go through the armor. These devices caused the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers, and they wounded many, many more.

Why do I bring that up?

Because this was perpetrated by this man, Qasem Soleimani, who is the head of the Quds Force—Iran's Revolutionary Guard terrorist outfit. He was orchestrating those attacks on American servicemembers. That is enough, right? We are doing a deal with a country that has a lot of American blood on its hands.

It is even worse than that. This deal relieves the international sanctions on

Qasem Soleimani and the Quds Force. It empowers the very people who harmed our servicemembers in Iraq. I think that that is an insult to the memories of the people who lost their lives on our behalf and an insult to their families.

For that reason, in addition to all of the other great ones that have been mentioned, we need to resoundingly reject this deal.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out for the record that Soleimani remains on the list.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, Prime Minister of Israel Netanyahu went to the U.N. with a graph, much like the one right beside me. It was a picture of a bomb with a red line. The Prime Minister said: "The red line must be drawn on Iran's nuclear enrichment program."

This deal does that.

Today, we can say that Iran cannot produce or stockpile highly enriched uranium, and it has to get rid of 98 percent of its low enriched uranium. To make sure that they don't achieve a nuclear weapon, we have the strictest inspection regimen in the history of nuclear agreements. The impetus for 2 years of negotiation has been achieved.

So what is the problem?

The gears of war are halted when we prove that negotiation and diplomacy are the best methods of achieving peace. This deal is a triumph of diplomacy over military conflict. It is a win for those who reject the misconception that diplomacy is weakness.

In 2003, Vice President Cheney said: "I have been charged by the President with making sure that none of the tyrannies in the world are negotiated with." The ensuing decades of war brought 6,840 U.S. soldiers home in coffins and squandered trillions of hard-earned, American tax dollars.

Yet, we have learned from that.

We have learned our lesson that we must negotiate, that we must talk it out before we begin to shoot it out. The fact that a majority of Americans supports this deal means that people are tired of sacrificing so much for the bankrupt idea that a conversation is capitulation.

This agreement keeps nuclear weapons out of Iran's hands for decades. In 2003, Iran had 164 centrifuges. In 2005, they had 3,000. In 2009, they had 8,000. By 2013, they had 22,000. While we were rattling sabers and making bravado-type comments about what we were going to do to them, they were making centrifuges. When the President got down to the business of negotiation, we had brought that process to a stop.

We will continue to sanction human rights violators wherever they are, including in Iran, and we will also continue to confront people who export terrorism; but the best way to empower reformers within Iran is to engage. Diplomatic victories require

playing the long game. You need patience, and you need unshakable courage in your convictions.

Let me say that I remember the moment in 2007 when then-Senator Obama said he would engage in personal diplomacy with leaders in the Middle East in order to stop bloodshed in the region. That is the moment that I knew I would vote for him, and I am proud to stand here nearly a decade later to congratulate the President for this diplomatic victory.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues have come to the floor today and have stated that this is the most important vote or the most important series of votes that we will take in this Congress. I agree with them because these votes boil down to the fundamental question:

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

What kind of a world do we want for ourselves? for our children? for our grandchildren? for future generations?

Do we want to live in a world where we legitimize the most radical, the most extremist, the most terrorist government in the world—a government that has a long and well-documented history of lying to the world? of holding Americans hostage? of hanging homosexuals from cranes? of executing juveniles?

Do we want to empower that government with an investment of at least \$56 billion, a portion of which will surely go to terrorist activities not just in the Middle East but all over the world?

Do we want to guarantee that whether it is in 10 years or in 13 years or in 15 years or in 20 years that that same government will have the ability to build a nuclear arsenal?

Do we want to afford that same government—the mullahs in Iran—the ability to have intercontinental ballistic missiles? Those aren't for Israel. Those aren't for the Middle East. Those are for us. The only purpose of those missiles is to carry a nuclear warhead.

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, many years from now, my daughters, ages 5 and 3, will look up how their dad voted on this critical issue. I think—and I am very hopeful and I am confident—that they will thank me, because this is a bad deal. This is a deal that not only endangers our allies in the Middle East, it endangers us. This is a deal where we have to ask ourselves who we are, what we stand for, and what kind of a world we want to live in.

For that reason, I am opposing the Iran deal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1930

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, our friend from Florida asks the right

questions. He has just got the wrong answer. I can answer those questions.

I want a world that rolls back the nuclear capability of Iran, not a world based on a false hope that we can make it work somehow without a plan.

That is what puts the world at risk. That is what puts my children and grandchildren at risk. I am not willing to take that risk.

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize Mrs. DAVIS of California, can I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 42½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Forty-two?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Okay. What a lucky man my friend from California is.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, after much deliberation and soul searching, I am convinced that the P5+1 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action creates a viable path to reduce Iran's nuclear weapons capability.

For that reason, I believe this agreement is in the best interest of the United States. Of course, the agreement must also be in the best interest of our friends in the Middle East.

As someone who has lived in Israel and has returned many times since, I understand that, for Israelis and Americans with close ties to Israel, Iran threatening to wipe Israel off the map is not an abstract concern.

It has been less than a hundred years since the Jewish people nearly suffered such a fate. The threat of annihilation is very real to Israelis, and it is very real to me.

I would never take a vote that I thought could leave my grandchildren a world without a strong, safe Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am under no illusions that this agreement will end Iran's hegemonic ambitions, but I can't allow their destabilizing behavior to have the protection of a nuclear umbrella.

I agree with the former head of the IDF, the Israeli Defense Force, the head of that intelligence agency, Amos Yadlin, that, if we walk away from this agreement, Iran will remain closer to a nuclear bomb in the coming years, and the chances of a collapse of the sanctions regime will increase.

Nobody in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, trusts Iran. That is why we need and we must have and take the responsibility to come together after this vote to make sure that the United States is exercising all of its initiative to implement this agreement and to address what we know will come, those inevitable challenges.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), a member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama announced that the P5+1 had reached an agreement on

Iran's nuclear program, he stated that the deal was not built on trust, that it was built on verification.

This was a clear acknowledgement by the administration that the Iran regime is not a trustworthy negotiating partner and that any agreement must contain stringent verification guidelines to ensure that Iran adheres to its obligations.

Unfortunately, the verification procedures in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action are impotent at best. While the agreement does allow for 24/7 monitoring of declared sites, it includes a provision that gives Iran up to 24 days to grant inspectors access to suspected undeclared facilities.

According to former IAEA officials, this greatly increases the probability that nefarious nuclear activities could escape detection.

While this verification scheme is already embarrassingly weak, it gets worse when one considers the secret side deals that prevent inspection of the Parchin military complex and allow Iran to inspect itself. This is not the "anytime, anywhere" inspections the administration claimed it was pursuing.

The fact is that, in spite of claims of the administration, this agreement is not built on verification. It is built on trust.

It requires us to trust a regime that is the largest exporter of terrorism in the world, that has already violated the interim nuclear agreement and whose Supreme Leader just today stated that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, as the President himself has said, no deal is better than a bad deal. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1963, President Kennedy, who served in this Chamber, spoke at American University about preventing nuclear war and that to do so it was necessary to deal with our most feared and distrusted enemy at the time, the Soviet Union, as mistrusted and evil in the eyes of Americans then as Iran is today. As you recall, Prime Minister Khrushchev boldly stated, "We will bury you."

President Kennedy understood, though, that in negotiations with an enemy, "We must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or nuclear war."

President Obama, along with the other five nations at the negotiating table in Vienna, confronted the same reality.

When President Reagan engaged in detente with the Soviet Union, he also was negotiating with our most feared and distrusted enemy.

In negotiations with Iran, it has been the same for President Obama as it was for President Kennedy in negotiating with the Soviet Union.

Both President Kennedy and President Obama had the same goals as

America has had for over a half a century, and that is to prevent nuclear war. And to do so, it has been necessary to deal with an untrusted foe.

I have listened to my constituents. I have been privy to many classified briefings. I have spoken personally to President Obama and Secretary Kerry.

I have met with officials in Vienna at the headquarters of the IAEA and with diplomats and officials from Europe and Asia and considered the opinions of renowned physicists and military generals.

Over those past several weeks and months, I have often thought about President Kennedy's eloquent words at American University in August of '63 when he said that, in the final analysis, "We all inhabit the same small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal." The same holds true today.

I support this agreement based upon the information I have gleaned from the aforementioned individuals and groups and with the understanding there is no more important mission than preventing nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, our people and our planet are in the balance. I am convinced this is the most effective way that Iran will not build a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me time and for the excellent job he has been doing tonight during the debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, this week is a somber week for our Nation. September the 11th reminds us of the sacred responsibility we, in Congress, have to protect the American people from those who want to kill us. That is why we must oppose the Iran deal.

This deal only emboldens our enemies at the expense of our friends and our own national security. So it is no surprise that a majority in Congress oppose this deal, as do most Americans, for many reasons.

First, it allows Iran to develop nuclear weapons in the future.

Second, it lists sanctions and frees up as much as \$150 billion in assets for Iran. These funds inevitably will be used by Iran to export terrorism as even the President himself has admitted.

Third, the longstanding arms embargo against Iran will be lifted. This enables Iran to buy long-range surface-to-air missiles from Russia by the end of the year.

Fourth, there is no credible way to conduct inspections of Iran's nuclear weapons-building sites. Under the proposed deal, Iran is given weeks, if not months, of advanced notice of any inspection. This provides ample time for Iran to hide evidence of nuclear weap-

ons activities and violate the agreement.

Secret deals that the administration has hidden from Congress and the American people have now been revealed. One secret deal permits Iran to conduct its own inspections at a military facility suspected of ties to nuclear weapons.

Finally, by increasing the odds of a nuclear Iran, this deal directly threatens the security and future of Israel. The Iran deal destabilizes the Middle East, jeopardizes America's security, and endangers the world. The Iran deal must be opposed now and in the future.

Remember, this is not the law of the land. This deal is a nonbinding executive agreement. Only the Constitution is the law of the land.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I hope our fellow Americans understand what is really at stake here: engagement and the rollback of a nuclear threat or the kinetic option, which is military intervention that takes us down a path that will lead to more terrorism, more violence, and the necessity of troops on the ground. I choose the former, and I believe our fellow Americans will, too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my vehement objection to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and to call on my colleagues to do the same.

In March, I joined 346 of my bipartisan colleagues in a letter outlining the issues needed to be addressed by Iran in a comprehensive nuclear agreement.

The last sentence of that agreement said: Congress must be convinced that the agreement's terms foreclose any pathway to a bomb, and then and only then will Congress be able to consider permanent sanctions relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this entire agreement, and I am profoundly disappointed to say that it falls remarkably short of foreclosing a pathway to a bomb.

To the contrary, this agreement brings Iran to the brink of becoming a nuclear weapons state and 8 short years from now provides them a pathway to acquiring technology to strike Europe and well beyond.

To ease the concerns of my noncommittal colleagues, the President has promised a military option remains on the table.

I am simply awestricken by the fact that my colleagues on the left have fallen for these assurances. It is the same administration that promised the red line in Syria.

It is the same empty rhetoric that has sustained the Syrian civil war, the Libyan civil war, ISIL's control of western Iraq, and, of course, the imperialist Vladimir Putin that has annexed the sovereign territory of the Ukraine.

I therefore urge my colleagues to reject this deal and any deal that enables

a belligerent state sponsor of terror to have access to hundreds of billions of dollars and nuclear weapons that will allow its atrocities to continue in perpetuity, all the while four Americans, one of them a native of the State of Michigan, my home State, Amir Hekmati, is being held hostage.

Mr. Speaker, in no other world, public or private, would this agreement be considered credible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. I was saying that, in no other world, Mr. Speaker—and to all of you—having served in the public and in the private sector, have I ever seen an agreement where we are negotiating with a party that has no respect for the other party.

In this case, the Supreme Leader of the State of Iran as late as yesterday referred to the United States as the Great Satan and called for us to be wiped off the face of the Earth, not just Israel.

We are the Great Satan. They are Satan, according to the Ayatollah. We are the Great Satan. I object to entering into an agreement with a country that has no respect.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking Democratic Leader PELOSI for her tireless and unyielding advocacy for the Iran nuclear deal agreed to between Iran and six major world powers, with the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council.

□ 1945

I very much share the leader's view that diplomacy and peace must be given every chance in our dealings with Iran before we contemplate the use of any other options.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that, acting with the President's full support, Secretary of State John Kerry has done a masterful job of holding the P5+1 coalition together. It was far from certain that Russia and China, intent as each of them is on reducing America's influence in the world, would continue their participation in the tough multinational effort necessary to get us to this point.

This agreement proves that world leaders, despite being divided on a range of issues, can still work together and reach an agreement with profound implications for international peace and security. This is truly extraordinary.

I support this agreement not because it is perfect, but because it is a deal that stands up extremely well as a barrier against nuclear proliferation for at least 15 years. It also establishes an intrusive inspections regimen to ensure that Iran's program remains heavily monitored and exclusively peaceful for even longer.

One of the most important provisions of this deal allows any permanent member of the U.N. Security Council who can show that Iran has violated the agreement the ability to snap back the tough sanctions that had previously been in place.

Now, I know there are critics who believe that, by rejecting the deal and increasing sanctions on Iran, that the U.S. can somehow coerce the leaders of Iran to completely dismantle its nuclear program. As effective as the current sanctions have been in bringing Iran to the table to negotiate, they have not stopped Iran from becoming a threshold nuclear state.

If Congress rejects this deal, it will not lead to a better one. If the U.S. walks away from this deal, we will have squandered the best chance we have to solve this problem through peaceful means. In fact, U.S. rejection of the deal is more likely to isolate the United States rather than Iran from the rest of the world.

It would reinforce questions around the world about our commitment to multilateralism and American political dysfunction. Furthermore, it would seriously undermine our ability to lead any future diplomatic efforts on terrorism and on a range of other issues important to our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which is necessary for the success of the nuclear deal, the preservation of the international financial sanctions architecture, and for maintaining the credibility of U.S. diplomatic commitments in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this ill-conceived agreement between our current administration and the fanatical regime ruling the nation of Iran.

I find it impossible to understand how those who are sworn to protect the security and interests of the American people could enter into such a one-sided deal. This is a deal that expands the lethal potential of a ruthless regime by giving them a path to a nuclear weapon; a regime whose stated objective is the destruction of the United States; a regime committed to the complete and utter destruction of Israel, our most trusted friend and ally in the Middle East; and a regime that almost no one believes will honor this deal.

It is incomprehensible that we would so blindly ignore the warnings of the world's most aggressive supporter of terrorism by allowing them access to \$150 billion in assets and allowing them to use those assets to project their war against our Nation and our allies.

If the rantings of this regime are not enough to cause us to reject this deal, then we should let history instruct us. This regime has been responsible for

the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers. This regime has been responsible for the deaths of innocent civilians in Israel and other nations. In 2009, this regime murdered their own citizens who courageously advocated for the freedom of the Iranian people. The actions of the Iranian regime speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, history is a great teacher, and I believe the past mistakes of world leaders who failed to recognize the lethal danger posed by ruthless and ambitious regimes have been written in the pages of history with the blood of millions upon millions of people.

We must not allow our Nation to take rank with those nations and leaders who chose appeasement over courage, who chose to take what appeared to them to be the easy path, instead of bearing the responsibility of making the harder decision because it was the right decision.

If the administration is correct that allowing the ruling regime in Iran to become armed with nuclear weapons will pose no threat to America and Israel, then no one will remember how the Members of this Congress voted; but if this administration and the supporters of this agreement are wrong and we suffer a catastrophic loss of lives, no one will ever forget what we did here. We will bear the burden of this vote for the rest of our lives.

America's foreign policy is at a crossroads. I am reminded how a great President described how we should deal with dangerous nations. President Theodore Roosevelt said we should speak softly and carry a big stick. He described this approach as the exercise of intelligent forethought and of decisive action sufficiently far in advance of any likely crisis. This deal does not meet that standard.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time when the burden of leadership that has been entrusted to every Member of Congress falls most heavily upon us. The American people look to us to do our duty and bear this responsibility without regard to party or politics, to put their safety and security first and foremost. I urge all the Members of this House to put aside the politics and partisanship that otherwise divide us and stand together in opposition to this deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the negotiations between world powers and Iran has always been to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon. I think we have to be realistic about this.

This agreement, as opposed to rejecting the agreement, takes us very far toward that goal; and I think accomplishes that goal in a way that we should all be able to live with and accept. The alternative is just too treacherous, I think, for us to even imagine.

I have been involved in this issue for as long as I have been here, this last 2½ years that I have been in Congress. I,

as many Members, have had countless hours of briefings. I have read the documents; I have read the classified reports, and I am confident that this agreement, simply put, makes the world a safer place, both for the U.S. and our allies.

What this agreement does not do, however—and I think it is important to keep in context—this agreement does not make Iran a good actor on the world stage. It is intended to tamp down their nuclear aspirations.

It doesn't mean that Iran can be trusted. In fact, the very nature of the agreement is that it will rely on inspections; it will rely on the eyes of the world to be on Iran to ensure that the agreement is adhered to with robust inspections.

Like any negotiated agreement, it is not perfect. If Iran cheats, we will know it through inspections. If Iran violates the agreement, our allies and the United States will be able to put back in place those sanctions that were so important to get them to the negotiating table in the first place. In fact, even if our allies don't agree, we would have the ability to unilaterally take steps to reinstate those important sanctions.

Finally, I think, importantly, under this question, the U.S. will be in a much stronger position than we are today if, in fact, military intervention ultimately is required because we will have allowed the diplomatic process to work, I believe, and I think most Americans believe, it strengthens our hand, it strengthens our standing in the world if, in fact, the necessity of military action does come upon us. The fact that we gave diplomacy a chance, I think, is a really important point.

Now, I have heard, from friends on both sides of the aisle, concern about the Americans that are being held, and this is a subject that I know something about. I represent the family of Amir Hekmati, and I appreciate the efforts of Members on both sides to call upon Iran to release the Americans that they hold.

I personally thank Chairman ROYCE for his effort through his leadership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to assist me in developing a resolution that allowed this House to speak with one voice on that question.

It would be a mistake, as some have suggested, to have included the freedom of innocent Americans as one of the provisions of an agreement because, by the very nature of an agreement through negotiation, in order to secure a concession, in order to secure the release of those Americans in exchange for something else that was negotiated at the bargaining table, we would have had to exchange something that makes the world a less safe place.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to the position taken by that young, brave man that I represent, that young marine, Amir Hekmati, who himself has said that the onus is on Iran to unilaterally release him and not to in-

clude him as part of a transaction that deals with Iran's nuclear capabilities.

That is the position that I take because I think it is the right position, but I think it is important to note that that is also the position that this brave young man, who for 4 years has been sitting in an Iranian jail cell, also takes.

Finally, we have to be honest with ourselves about the question that is before us. Now, if I were to have written this agreement by myself, it would be a different agreement, and I am sure that is true of virtually everybody in this House.

The fact of the matter is, when evaluating our position on this question, we have to first search our own conscience, but we have to measure the effect of this agreement and the consequences of adhering to it and enacting this agreement with the consequences of walking away from a multilateral negotiated agreement with no prospect.

Listen to the voices of the other nations involved, with no prospect of being able to come back to the negotiating table.

The conclusion, I think, that I have come to in examining my conscience is that we are in a far better position as a world and we are far more secure through this agreement than we would be with the uncertainty of walking away from the diplomatic process and allowing Iran to pursue a nuclear weapon in the next months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conclusion that I have come to, but this is also the conclusion that experts on both sides of the political spectrum have come to.

Ambassadors from across the world—former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright thinks this is the right path forward; former Secretary of State Colin Powell thinks this is the right path forward.

I understand that individuals in this House may come to different conclusions after examining the facts. The only thing I ask and encourage my colleagues to do is to vote your heart. Vote what you think is right.

Examine the documents and do what you think is in the best interests of this country and of the world, and the conclusion that I have come to is that supporting this agreement is the right thing.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would also point out, though, that we have heard from many experts. We have heard from many generals, admirals, and there are over 200 generals and flag officers, admirals who have come to the opposite conclusion, who have come to the conclusion that this makes the country less safe, and throughout the course of the afternoon

and evening here, supporters of this agreement have argued that we will be aggressive against Iran, aggressive against Iran on its regional aggression, aggressive against Iran on its human rights violations.

□ 2000

I will just bring up some concerns I have for the consideration of the body here.

I don't see it. This administration was silent during Iran's Green revolution, when the Iranian people were in the streets revolting against the regime at the time of the stolen election there in Iran. They needed U.S. leadership the most at that time.

And since the administration began its negotiations with Iran, we have had a grand total of three human rights abuse designations from the administration—three designations against the backdrop of a record number of executions under the so-called moderate Rouhani, more executions this year than under alternative leadership in the past.

So if you are seeing unparalleled levels of repression and executions and we don't see that being countered forcefully, I come to a certain conclusion. I see the same thing with the administration not confronting Assad's mass murders. Assad is Iranian-backed.

From my standpoint, if the administration is locked into an agreement, I will tell you how I think. I presume the administration will defend that agreement, and I presume that that will mean ignoring Iran's abuses at home and probably ignoring Iran's aggression abroad. The negotiations were a constraint on the administration taking action and protesting, and I presume that the new agreement is going to be a constraint on the administration's taking action against Iran.

I am just pointing out my view of this, based upon what I have observed going back to the Green revolution and this desire for a rapprochement with Iran. I wish that the administration would take on a new life in confronting Iran. I don't see it. And we will have a really bad deal to contend with.

The other part about the deal, and other points were made here tonight, but sanctions relief provided to Iran under this agreement will enable them to increase the size and scope of their ballistic missiles.

So the other observation I would make is the medium-and long-term threat of an Iranian ballistic missile that can reach the United States is very real. That is what we have heard from so many retired officers and what we have heard from the Pentagon, and yet the administration has been reluctant to ensure that the United States has adequate protective measures to guard the homeland against the Iranian ballistic missile threat.

The missile defense program has suffered greatly under President Obama. One of his first major decisions was to cut funding for the Missile Defense

Agency. Then there was the unilateral abrogation of signed missile defense agreements with our allies Poland and the Czech Republic in terms of the interceptor program that was supposed to defend Europe and the United States against any future Iranian potential launch.

And contrary to the representation provided to Congress as part of the New START, the President canceled phase 4 of the European missile defense plan, which was specifically designed to increase protection of the U.S. homeland.

So now that this agreement will pump resources and technology advancements into the ballistic missile threat to the U.S. by Iran, my other hope is that this institution will have uniform opposition to the administration's record of cutting missile defense and support proactive measures to protect the U.S. homeland. Because I will remind everyone here, Iran claims today that they are not bound in this agreement on the issue of ballistic missiles. They do not recognize the U.N. sanctions on their ballistic missiles, and they are claiming we did not put it specifically into the agreement. So as far as they are concerned, they are moving forward. They are moving forward with their ballistic missile program.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Iran agreement.

In 2009, I was able to visit Israel and was in separate meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu, then-President Peres, and the Israeli Chief of Staff of the IDF, or Israeli Defense Forces. I asked the same question: What would it take to stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon? And they all gave me the same answer. They said: You have to impose economic sanctions that are tough enough that the Government of Iran fears a collapse of the economy and a resulting loss of power. And that is the only thing short of war that will cause them to give up their quest for a nuclear weapon.

The Obama administration, merely to bring them to the negotiating table, threw them a lifeline and relaxed economic sanctions. And then, even before going to the Congress of the United States, they went to the United Nations to unravel economic sanctions on Iran.

Michael Oren, Ambassador to the United States from Israel, said that, even though the President has tried to box the Congress in—the United States has a \$17 trillion economy, and that by the United States imposing economic sanctions on Iran, that in fact other countries will be forced to follow in order to be able to do business with the United States.

This is really the hope and change applied to American national security. The hope and change is that the conduct of Iran will change over time; that the ruling mullahs will in fact somehow become enlightened. And that

when they say “death to America,” it is more of a cultural expression.

In 1983, 241 marines died from an Iranian-backed Hezbollah guerilla in a truck bomb.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COFFMAN. In 1996, 19 airmen died in the Khobar Towers by an Iranian-backed attack.

When they say “death to Americans,” they mean death to Americans.

In 2005, I was in Iraq with the United States Marine Corps, and we were losing soldiers and marines on the ground due to IEDs, but we up-armored our vehicles and we did better route reconnaissance and security. Iran introduced what was called an EFP—a shape charge, or an explosive force penetrator—that was designed to penetrate the thickest hulls of our vehicles and killed hundreds of soldiers and marines on the ground. When the Iranians say “death to Americans,” they mean it.

This deal will threaten the stability of the region, the security of the United States and of Israel, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for leading this debate on our behalf, and I want to thank her for the great work she has been doing on all of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3461, legislation to approve the Iran nuclear agreement. While I will admit this deal is not absolutely perfect, I believe it does offer the best chance of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is an opportunity, the likes of which we could not even imagine a few years ago: a chance to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and to do so without engaging in another costly and bloody war.

Now, I did not reach this conclusion lightly. I did so only after closely examining the deal and the classified and unclassified supplementary documents. I also spoke to experts and numerous officials who were closely involved in the talks, including one of the IAEA inspectors, and carefully weighed the arguments from both sides.

While I still have some concerns, I simply do not see an alternative that will constrain Iran's nuclear program and maintain the global cooperation needed to enforce these limits.

Mr. Speaker, the plain language of this agreement explicitly states that “under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.” There is no waiver, no exception, no qualifier or sunset. Iran may never have a nuclear weapon, period. That is what the agreement says.

Now, of course, nobody believes a simple affirmation alone is enough, especially with Iran's history, which is

why this deal imposes tough limitations on Iran and includes safeguards to better ensure that if Iran cheats, we will know and can respond by reimposing economic sanctions, or, as the President has indicated, the military option remains on the table.

I want to note some of the limitations that are in the agreement.

Iran must cut its low enriched uranium stockpile by 96 percent. It currently has 7,500 kilograms of low enriched uranium. It has to cut that to 300 kilograms—from 7,500 to 300.

Iran must cut its centrifuge capacity by over 66 percent—from 19,000 centrifuges to 6,104; and of the 5,000 it may run, all must be the lower efficiency, first generation centrifuges.

The reactor core in the heavy water plant at Arak must be removed and filled with concrete, making it unusable for nuclear weapons, and it must be redesigned for nuclear energy purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this deal is not based on trust. In fact, it assumes Iran will try to cheat. That is why the inspections regime is so intrusive. In addition, IAEA inspectors will have full access to all declared sites and use of the most advanced technology available.

It also subjects Iran's entire nuclear fuel cycle to inspections, from uranium mining to waste disposal and every stage in between. No other member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is subject to that scrutiny, nor would we be inspecting Iran's whole fuel cycle if we trusted them.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about something. The United States did not negotiate this agreement alone. This was a joint effort with the UK, Germany, France, China, Russia, and the EU. Those countries are in a more vulnerable position than the United States if Iran should violate this agreement.

Now, any observer of foreign affairs will tell you that in recent years it has been next to impossible to get this mix of countries to agree on anything, much less a deal with such significance as this. Yet that is what we have here—an agreement that major global powers back and are ready to enforce the agreement. And if we sabotage it now, if we are the only country to say “no” to diplomacy and “yes” to military action, we may very well do so alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, this agreement is not perfect. However, no one got everything they wanted in this agreement. For every critic who says the P5+1 gave away too much, there is one in Iran who says the Iranians did the same.

This deal has vast potential, but its success will ultimately hinge on its implementation. It would be better use of our energies to focus on ensuring that this deal succeeds and that the IAEA has what is necessary to carry out its mandate.

One final point, if some of the critics are right and we eventually have to resort to a military option with or without our international neighbors, I

think it would be much better for us to have had hundreds of inspectors on the ground inspecting nuclear and non-nuclear facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. It would be far better for us and our international allies to have had international inspectors—hundreds—on the ground in Iran, so that if we do have to take military action, we have that information, we have that intelligence, so that any military action that eventually is necessary will be much more effective.

But I agree that this agreement is our best chance, this opportunity for diplomacy, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

□ 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong disagreement with the President's deal.

Tonight is the eve of the 14th anniversary of attacks on America by radical Islamic terrorists. These were direct, premeditated attacks on our soil that targeted and murdered thousands of Americans, just because they were Americans.

It was a dirty, cowardly act that reflects the lack of civility and values of all terrorists, those who finance terror, those who plan terror attacks, and those who carry them out.

Who would have thought we would be here at this time debating whether to approve an agreement with the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world, a deal with a country that chants "death to America" while holding four American hostages, a deal that removes sanctions and allows billions of dollars to flow into a regime that wants to annihilate us and our allies, a deal that allows thousands of centrifuges to continue spinning and enriching nuclear fuel that can and most likely will be used in nuclear weapons.

There is a better way to deal with this regime, by not making any concessions until Iran ends their support of terrorism and demonstrates they can be civilized and trusted. They must earn our trust.

Mr. Speaker, America's \$18 trillion to \$19 trillion economy dwarfs Iran's \$400 billion economy, and some sell America short to say that the world would stand with Iran over us if we kept our sanctions and showed resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day when America negotiated with terrorists, and I certainly never thought I would see the day when those who swore to protect her would agree to a deal shrouded in secrecy—not Congress' deal, not the American people's deal, the President's and the minority that supports its deal that jeopardizes so much of our safety and security and gains so little.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage a strong "no" vote on this deal. I encourage this Chamber, the Senate, and the administration to do the right thing by rejecting this deal in its entirety; and I pray that God would intervene and help us.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress—in fact, the only Ph.D. scientist of any kind—I have taken very seriously my responsibility to review the technical aspects of the proposed agreement.

After over a dozen briefings, many of them individual classified briefings by the technical experts who have supported our negotiators, I have come to support this deal not based on trust of Iran, but based on science.

I would like to take a moment to make four technical points that underpin my support of this deal.

First, in regards to the claim that "Iran gets to be in charge of inspecting itself" in investigations of its past weaponization activities, this is simply not true. The investigations will be carried out by a team of IAEA inspectors, using equipment and sampling kits prepared by the IAEA, with samples being sent to the international Network of Analytical Laboratories, of which a number of U.S. laboratories are members.

I urge my colleagues who harbor doubts about this inspection regime to avail themselves of classified briefings on the details. What I can say publicly is that our technical experts have full confidence in the technical inspection capability of the IAEA.

Secondly, in regards to the 24-day inspection delay, which has been a source of concern for many, including myself, under the proposed agreement, Iran's declared nuclear facilities will be available for anytime, anywhere inspection.

However, for undeclared facilities, including military facilities, Iran has the opportunity to contest what is normally a 24-hour inspection regime under the nonproliferation treaty and additional protocol for a period of up to 24 days. This is clearly not ideal. It is a negotiated number.

However, when I look closely at the many steps that must be taken to produce and to test a nuclear weapon, the ability to detect activities in a window of 24 days versus 24 hours has limited operational significance.

This is because, while many steps toward weaponization can unfortunately be hidden from even a 24-hour inspection, things like design and testing of nonnuclear components, but the moment that Iran touches nuclear materials, it will be subject to detection by the IAEA, even months after any attempted scrubbing of the facility.

Thirdly, I support the administration's estimate of a 1-year minimum

breakout time. This is the reaction time that the world community will have for a diplomatic, economic, and military response if Iran decides to resume its nuclear weapons program.

Because of the importance of this issue, I have spent a great deal of time and effort personally vetting this estimate. The breakout time calculation is complex because there are many possible paths to obtain the fissile material for a first weapon, and each of these must be examined.

After many hours of study and detailed questioning of our experts, I have concluded that the 1-year estimate for the minimum breakout time is accurate.

Fourth, in regards to the weaponization timeline, this is the time needed by Iran from the point that it possesses a sufficient quantity of nuclear material for a first weapon, to the time that it will take them to assemble and to test that first nuclear weapon.

Unfortunately, Iran has made significant progress toward weaponization, including such items as the multipoint initiation system for implosion devices that is referenced in the IAEA report of 2011.

Moreover, if Iran breaks out of this agreement, it will resume the weaponization activities during the same year that it takes to accumulate fissile materials for a first weapon.

Therefore, I concur with the assessment that, in the context of a 1-year breakout effort, the additional time for weaponization may be small. However, at the end of this agreement, when the breakout time to obtain fissile material is shortened, the weaponization activities become the dominant factor in the time line.

This underscores the importance of maintaining maximum visibility into all aspects of the Iranian nuclear capability, a position that is surely strengthened by the adoption of this agreement and, also, of significantly strengthening the nonproliferation treaty for Iran and for all other nuclear threshold countries.

This must be the work of the coming decade, so that by the end of the main terms of this agreement, Iran and its neighbors in the Middle East and around the world will be bound by a much stronger and more verifiable nonproliferation treaty.

As was emphasized by former Senators Dick Lugar and Sam Nunn, two gentlemen who have actually reduced the threat of nuclear war, instead of just talking about it, that this is not a perfect deal, but it is the best path forward and our best chance to achieve our goal of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as the best opportunity to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Remember, we did not negotiate this deal alone, but if we walk away, we walk away alone.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We did not negotiate this deal alone. Also negotiating this deal was Iran and was Russia and was China—true enough—but when it comes to the question of inspections, I do not have the document that indicates how these inspections will be done; but what I do know is what is reported to be the procedure and what is asserted also by the Iranians to be the procedure.

As reported, it is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the agencies the photos of the locations. It is Iran that will provide the Agency videos of the locations. It is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the Agency the environmental samples. It is Iran that will use Iran's authenticated equipment, not the equipment of the international inspectors.

The point I make, again, is that one of the reasons we wanted to have the agreements, the side agreements, the two side agreements, including the one addressing the 12 questions that have never been answered about the thousand pages of bomb work that the IAEA had in its possession, that Iran supposedly conducted at Parchin, was to get Iran to answer these questions. To this day, to my knowledge, scientists in Iran are not available to answer these questions.

Now, perhaps if we obtain these documents, these two side agreements, we will have the details that assure us that, finally, these 12 questions have been answered, but I can tell you, during the interim agreement, we only got half of the first question answered, and after that, Iran shut it down. There was to be no more discussion about their past bomb work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

(Mr. KELLY of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

On the eve of September 11, I remember the American lives lost to terrorism and the unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement, combined with my personal experience of being deployed in the Army in Iraq in 2005 and, again, in 2009 and 2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe that Iran will act in good faith in this agreement.

It is not just my concerns that I have regarding this deal, but it is also my concerns I have consistently heard throughout the August work month from my constituents, regardless of party affiliation, that did not support this agreement with Iran.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran, a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984, access to billions of dollars to finance terrorism activities in the region and

to get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

I oppose with all my heart and soul the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security, nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East, nor is it in the best interest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the administration's Iran nuclear agreement.

On the Eve of September 11, we remember the lives lost and unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement combined with my personal experience of being deployed to Iraq in 2005 and again in 2009–2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe Iran will act in good faith.

It is not just concerns I have regarding the deal, but concerns I consistently heard from constituents, regardless of party affiliation, during the August work period.

Just this week, Iran's Supreme Leader said America remains the "Great Satan" and reiterated his desire to wipe Israel off the map. Common sense would prevail that the goal of Iran's nuclear program is not to promote peace but exactly the opposite.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran—a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984—access to billions of dollars to finance terrorist activities in the region and get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

Increased access to wealth coupled with a lack of "anytime, anywhere" inspections will only allow Iran to increase their support of terrorism in the region to groups like Hamas and Hezbollah and is not nearly sufficient in stopping their pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

I oppose the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe that the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this agreement is the best option available to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The alternatives are simply too risky and too costly, which is why the deal's opponents have failed to articulate a realistic alternative.

During my time in Congress, I have voted for every bill that imposed crippling sanctions on Iran, which brought the regime to the negotiating table and united the world to stop Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

Sanctions were meant to be a tool to ensure negotiations; that is exactly what they have done, but as we have learned from the past decade, sanctions alone are not enough to stop Iran from expanding its nuclear program.

Before negotiations began, Iran greatly increased its enrichment stockpile and centrifuge capacity, despite sanctions. That is why a verifiable agreement that will cut off Iran's ability to build a nuclear weapon is necessary.

The International Atomic Energy Agency will have nearly continuous access to Iran's declared nuclear facilities and can gain unprecedented access to other suspicious, undeclared sites in as little as 24 hours.

Under this agreement, Iran will dismantle two-thirds of its installed centrifuges, remove over 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and make changes to its Arak plutonium reactor before it receives sanctions relief.

United States Department of Energy Secretary and nuclear physicist Ernest Moniz has confirmed that the agreement increases Iran's breakout time significantly for well over a decade, from 2 to 3 months today to at least 12 months moving forward. This additional time will give us ample opportunity to catch and stop Iran should it choose to pursue a nuclear weapon.

Some have suggested that we need to reject this deal in order to get a better one, but I have found no evidence to believe that a better deal is possible.

It is clear that some of our negotiating partners and other allies do not want more sanctions. If we reject this deal, the robust international sanctions regime would certainly erode, if not unravel entirely.

In the meantime, Iran could move forward with its enrichment program without inspections; limitations on manufacturing, installation, research, and development of new centrifuges; and constraints on its enriched uranium stockpile. Simply put, no deal would mean no inspections and no constraints on Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Some have suggested that we cannot make an agreement with a country that we do not trust, but we must remember that this deal is not based on trust, but rather the most intrusive inspections regime upon which we have ever agreed.

We did not trust the Soviet Union, especially when we negotiated an arms reduction treaty with them as we fought in devastating proxy wars around the world.

□ 2030

Today we are not debating whether to trust Iran. We are debating whether and how we should enhance monitoring of its nuclear program.

I remain committed to working with the administration and my colleagues here in Congress to contain Iran's conventional capabilities that threaten stability in the region and throughout the world, but know that this deal is the best option to take the nuclear issue out of the equation.

I urge my colleagues to approve this agreement.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of viewing this as the most intrusive regime, I remember South Africa. We put the kinds of sanctions on South Africa that we tried to get the administration to put on Iran.

We had legislation here by a vote of 400-20 to do that, and the administration blocked that legislation in the Senate. That would have given us real leverage.

Why do I think so? Because in South Africa, when we put those sanctions on, it actually gave the regime a choice between compromise on its nuclear program and dropping apartheid and changing its system or economic collapse.

The choice was made in South Africa to turn over their nuclear bomb to the international inspectors. Now, I would consider that an intrusive regime. I wouldn't consider this one.

In the case of Libya, they turned over their weapons programs to international inspectors, allowed them in, allowed them to take them out.

I don't know why we say this is the most intrusive regime. It seems to me that, clearly, in cases where we actually forced the issue, where we actually in South Africa put the totality of sanctions in place, that Congress both in the House and the Senate in a bipartisan way felt were mandatory to force the South African hand.

In that case, yes, we got them to give up their nuclear capabilities and their right to enrich and all of that. I don't see that here.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, for months now, the President has made promises that we have heard that would prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons through strict oversight.

Unfortunately, we see now that this deal does not do that at all. The Iranian regime has done nothing to earn the trust of the international community, yet this agreement rewards Iran with sanctions relief.

I was a member of the Iran Sanctions Conference Committee, and I support tough, strict sanctions against this regime.

You see, the Iran sanctions were designed to force a peaceful resolution to this ongoing situation. It was clear to many that the sanctions were working.

Iran had an inflation rate of 35 percent, the value of its currency was falling, and its monetary reserves were dwindling.

Iran had no choice but to come to the negotiation table. So the U.S. was in a position of power to negotiate a good deal.

Instead, we have a deal which allows Iran to continue to use centrifuges, a deal that allows them to continue to enrich uranium, a deal where, after 15 years, it will be unclear what, if any, access the inspectors will have to their facilities, and a deal where Iran can dispute inspections and delay for 24 days.

This is not, by the way, "anytime, anywhere" inspections that the administration also promised us.

The President may claim that this deal is built on verifications. That is simply not true. We now know that

Congress hasn't even received all the details related to the deal. There are side deals as well.

So what makes us believe that Iran will abide by the agreement that we see, let alone by the side deals that we have not seen?

This deal asks us to trust a country that holds American hostages, that tortures its own people, and that has called for the destruction of the United States and its allies. It is not a surprise that Iran and its allies are celebrating.

However, it is obvious that this deal does little to advance U.S. security. We can still reject this severely flawed deal. There are still alternatives. The U.S. can use sanctions, sanctions that have worked to negotiate a good deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. We can use those sanctions, those sanctions from the very committee that I was on, to negotiate a good deal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting the security of the United States and protecting the security of our allies as well by rejecting this misguided deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE. He has actually dealt with this and done this very honorably.

It has been powerful to watch. There has been amazing testimony given to us. There have been great speakers here. But I fear something very important has not gotten enough understanding and enough focus.

Who in this body is going to take responsibility when the Iranian regime is flush with cash and the death and destruction that is coming with that?

Who here is going to take responsibility for the displaced people around the region?

Who here is going to take responsibility for what some of the experts have told us, the potential financing of a Sunni-Shia war in the region, the amount of death, whether it be the \$59 billion the administration talks about or the \$150 billion that sits in accounts around the world that is about to be handed back to the regime?

I hold up this board next to me so you can see this is more. This is so much more than just the neighbors around Iran.

The bad acts have been happening all over the world. Tell me why there is Iranian Revolutionary Guard money,

Quds Force money showing up in our hemisphere.

Earlier this year I was at a series of meetings in Panama. We had parliamentarians from the region speaking to us, telling us that they are actually seeing Iranian money moving through their banks, financing bad actors in their region, creating death and destruction, trying to finance the overthrows of their governments. That is in our own hemisphere.

Are we prepared as a body, particularly those who will vote for this, to step up and take responsibility for the lives that are about to be lost, for the governments that are going to be overthrown and the destruction and displaced people, the refugees, the cascades that are going to come from that?

We are about to hand billions and billions and billions of dollars to a regime that is committed to destroying our way of life, but also to destroying their own neighbors.

That is what is on the line right now. We are about to execute a vote here that is going to kill, maim, destabilize not only the region; the world.

Those who are about to vote for this, I expect you to step up and be responsible for what you have done.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot in these debates that have gone on today. I would like to take this opportunity to try to reinforce the tremendous support that we have for this deal.

I would like to also debunk the idea that somehow this administration is not concerned enough about the security of this country.

Let me just share with you the tremendous support that this deal has. I will do that by reading some excerpts from and insert into the RECORD an open letter signed by 36 retired U.S. generals and admirals who make the case that addressing the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is far superior than trying to do it militarily.

In their letter, these retired military leaders say about the nuclear agreement with Iran, "There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon," "If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark."

Recognizing the importance of strong multilateral coordination and action, the retired military leaders go on to say, "If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones."

Mr. Speaker and Members, while I have great respect for all of the Members of this House, for the most part, I do not accept the notion that Members who have not served in the way that these generals and admirals have served this country would know better about our security.

So I would like to insert that letter into the RECORD.

THE IRAN DEAL BENEFITS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY—AN OPEN LETTER FROM RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

On July 14, 2015, after two years of intense international negotiations, an agreement was announced by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China and Russia to contain Iran's nuclear program. We, the undersigned retired military officers, support the agreement as the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The international deal blocks the potential pathways to a nuclear bomb, provides for intrusive verification, and strengthens American national security. America and our allies, in the Middle East and around the world, will be safer when this agreement is fully implemented. It is not based on trust; the deal requires verification and tough sanctions for failure to comply.

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. Military action would be less effective than the deal, assuming it is fully implemented. If the Iranian's cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

We agree with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said on July 29, 2015, "[r]elieving the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is superior than trying to do that militarily."

If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones.

For these reasons, for the security of our Nation, we call upon Congress and the American people to support this agreement.

GEN James "Hoss" Cartwright, U.S. Marine Corps;

GEN Joseph P. Hoar, U.S. Marine Corps;

GEN Merrill "Tony" McPeak, U.S. Air Force;

GEN Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN Robert G. Gard, Jr., U.S. Army;

LGEN Arlen D. Jameson, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN Frank Kearney, U.S. Army;

LGEN Claudia J. Kennedy, U.S. Army;

LGEN Donald L. Kerrick, U.S. Army;

LGEN Charles P. Otstott, U.S. Army;

LGEN Norman R. Seip, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN James M. Thompson, U.S. Army;

VADM Kevin P. Green, U.S. Navy;

VADM Lee F. Gunn, U.S. Navy;

MGEN George Buskirk, U.S. Army;

MGEN Paul D. Eaton, U.S. Army;

MGEN Marcelite J. Harris, U.S. Air Force;

MGEN Frederick H. Lawson, U.S. Army;

MGEN William L. Nash, U.S. Army;

MGEN Tony Taguba, U.S. Army;

RADM John Hutson, U.S. Navy;

RADM Malcolm MacKinnon III, U.S. Navy;

RADM Edward "Sonny" Masso, U.S. Navy;

RADM Joseph Sestak, U.S. Navy;

RADM Garland "Gar" P. Wright, U.S. Navy;

BGEN John Adams, U.S. Air Force;

BGEN Stephen A. Cheney, U.S. Marine Corps;

BGEN Patricia "Pat" Foote, U.S. Army;

BGEN Lawrence E. Gillespie, U.S. Army;

BGEN John Johns, U.S. Army;

BGEN David McGinnis, U.S. Army;

BGEN Stephen Xenakis, U.S. Army;

RDML James Arden "Jamie" Barnett, Jr., U.S. Navy;

RDML Jay A. DeLoach, U.S. Navy;

RDML Harold L. Robinson, U.S. Navy;

RDML Alan Steinman, U.S. Coast Guard.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. And, further, I would like to share with you something from someone that I came to know very well. It is a Washington Post article that I am going to quote from.

The quotes will be from Republican and former Treasury Secretary Paulson. He will not only make very strong statements about his support for this deal, he slams the naysayers of this Iranian deal.

Let me read from the Washington Post article from August 14 in which former Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson was asked what he thought about the viability of maintaining multilateral nuclear sanctions against Iran if the United States decided to walk away from the nuclear deal that has just been agreed to between Iran and the international community.

It is important to note that former Secretary Paulson, a Republican, was in charge of administering the administration's sanctions under President George W. Bush during the period when the international community was just beginning to enact the current regime of punitive sanctions over Iran's nuclear ambitions.

This was his response, "It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this, with the five other parties, and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us."

Paulson also viewed as far-fetched the idea that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hard-line approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Again, Mr. Paulson said:

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal, that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

□ 2045

In fact, the former Treasury Secretary could barely hide his disdain for those who think they could strike a path to a better deal than one that has been reached.

Further, he said: "I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big,

intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions."

He said: "You were deciding between doing something that objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable. So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 2015]

REPUBLICAN AND FORMER TREASURY SECRETARY PAULSON SLAMS NAYSAYER OF IRAN DEAL

(By Karoun Demirjian)

Not many high-profile Republicans have anything nice to say about the Iran deal.

But former Treasury secretary Hank Paulson—the guy who was in charge of the government's sanctions operation under President George W. Bush, when the international community was just setting up this regime of punitive measures over Iran's nuclear ambitions—thinks at this point, it would be pretty ill-advised to back away.

"It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we've, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this with the five other, you know, parties and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us," Paulson said during a forum sponsored by the Aspen Institute on Thursday night to discuss his new book on China.

"And unilateral sanctions don't work, okay?" Paulson continued. "They really have to be multilateral."

Paulson was responding to a question from the moderator of the event, who had asked what Paulson thought about the viability of maintaining sanctions against Iran, should the United States walk away from the agreement struck in Vienna last month. Congress will vote on that very question next month, but naysayers need a veto-proof, two-thirds majority in both houses to kill the deal—a formidable hurdle to clear.

In Congress and on the campaign trail, the critics of the deal—many, though not all of them Republicans—have been advocating ripping up the agreement and either leaving the U.S. sanctions in place or stepping them up to make the point to Iran and the international community that the United States means business. Some lawmakers, including Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), and candidates have even suggested that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hardline approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Paulson thinks that idea is farfetched.

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

Sanctions against Iran have become far more extensive since Paulson left office. And Paulson's comments, delivered in a resort city in Colorado, may not carry that much weight among his GOP colleagues in Washington.

The former Goldman Sachs chief executive came to the Treasury Department in 2006 on the eve of a colossal financial crash and left as a controversial figure for the policies he spearheaded. Since leaving that post, he has broken from the mainstream GOP party line to advocate for more attention to issues like climate change.

Even others in the Bush administration probably wouldn't agree with Paulson: His former boss, George W., advised against lifting Iran sanctions this spring.

But Iran sanctions are Paulson's wheelhouse, and while he didn't direct any darts toward specific politicians or give his own point-by-point assessment of the merits of the deal, Paulson's disdain for those who think they can strike a path to a better solution than the one reached in Vienna was apparent.

"I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big, intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions," Paulson said. "You were deciding between doing something that was objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable."

"So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea," Paulson said.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I would like to discuss a point that I do not think has been given enough attention yet in this debate. Iran could move in any direction over the next 15 years and the postagreement dynamics in Iran would play out in a number of ways. We are aware of the less benign scenarios.

There is also the scenario in which the agreement helps to amplify the voices of those in Iran who want peace in regional and international accommodation. I have hope with respect to this latter possibility, and I will tell you why.

It is because more than half the population of Iran today—almost 55 percent—is under 30 years old, and the youth unemployment rate is somewhere between 27 and 40 percent. I hope that these young people, given the opportunity to work, to achieve prosperity, and to live peacefully, will, in fact, help animate the kind of change in Iran that will, indeed, move it to become a responsible member of the world community.

This is a possibility that I urge Members to keep in mind when they vote on the resolution before us today.

I have no more time, but I would just urge my colleagues to support this important deal and agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would like to also submit later for the RECORD a letter by 200 retired generals and flag officers and admirals in terms of why they are opposed to this deal and why they feel it would make the national security challenges for the United States more problematic.

The second point I would make is that Nasrallah, who is the head of Hezbollah, says this about this deal:

Iran will become richer and wealthier and will also become more influential under the deal reached this week. This will also reinforce the position of its allies. A stronger and wealthier Iran in the coming phase will be able to stand by its allies and especially the Palestinian resistance more than at any other time in history.

What does that mean? I can tell you what it means because, in 2006, when I

chaired the Terrorism Subcommittee, we were in Haifa when Nasrallah was firing off the Iranian-made rockets with 90,000 ball bearings in the warheads into the town of Haifa; there were 600 victims inside the trauma hospitals, and now, Iran has transferred over 80,000 missiles.

What is it Nasrallah wants that he doesn't have currently? He wants guidance systems so that those missiles will hit targets, such as individual buildings in Tel Aviv, the airport, Jerusalem. That is what he needs. That is what Iran is telling Nasrallah it will provide.

It needs the hard currency and with this agreement will come the hard currency. It is also committed to restock the inventory that Hamas used when it fired off its rockets into Israel from Gaza and to rebuild the tunnels; all of this is what the Iranians seek to fund, but to do that, they need the sanctions lifted.

When they lift those sanctions, who is going to be the primary beneficiary? It is going to be people such as the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps that will be strengthened.

Look, Mr. Speaker, if this agreement goes through, Iran gets a cash bonanza. It gets a boost to its international standing. It gets a lighted path toward nuclear weapons. With sweeping sanctions relief, we have lessened our ability to challenge Iran's conduct across the board. As Iran grows stronger, we will be weaker to respond.

The question before us today is whether temporary constraints on Iran's nuclear program are worth the price of permanent sanctions relief. When I say the Revolutionary Guard is going to be the beneficiary, I say that because they are the ones that have taken over so many of the major companies in Iran and they are working to destabilize the entire Middle East.

That organization fuels the Assad regime in Syria today. Those rockets are being launched by the Quds Force into Israel. They are going to provide them with more weapons and more military personnel. That organization backs the Houthis rebels. There were 200 Quds Forces that were on the vanguard when they overthrew our ally in Yemen, and they overran that country.

It is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq. The IRGC exports terrorism throughout that region. It holds sway over Iran's nuclear program. It brutally, brutally represses internal dissent, and as part of the Iranian agreement, the IRGC is going to be bolstered in a big way, and I will explain how else. It is going to have the funds to build up its tanks, its fighter jets, and the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The European sanctions on the elite Quds Forces—this is the group that does the political assassinations, assassinations outside Iran, and does the terrorist work outside of Iran—that is going to be lifted on the European side.

The administration signed off on these concessions. The deal will allow

sales of aircraft and parts to Iranian airlines, which the Quds Force uses to move its people and weapons throughout the region. The IRGC controls key parts, as I said, of the Iranian economy—the largest construction companies, the telecom sector, shipping.

Ninety current and former IRGC officials and companies will be taken off the sanctions list as a result of this deal. Even sanctions on the head of Iran's elite Quds Force, General Soleimani, will be coming off. Soleimani had been involved in the plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador here in Washington, D.C.

While still under a UN travel ban, Soleimani traveled to Moscow on July 24, 10 days after the Iran nuclear agreement was announced, and he held meetings with the Russian Defense Minister and with President Vladimir Putin. Believe me, those meetings are about weapon systems, which the Russians want to sell to the Quds Force, to the Iranians.

The IRGC is the biggest sponsor of terror throughout the Middle East and even tried to carry out a terrorist attack here. Under the nuclear agreement, as Iran is reconnected to the global economy, the IRGC is going to be the biggest winner.

The agreement helps legitimize Soleimani and gives additional resources to the mastermind behind the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism and eyeing future weapon sales.

It was Russia that teamed up with Iran in the eleventh hour, after we thought this deal was done, to insist on one more thing, the lifting of the arms embargo. I just ask you: If they did that, whose side do you think Moscow is going to take when Iran tests this agreement?

Now, we talked a little bit about the younger generation in Iran. Yes, yes, 55 percent is under 30, but it is not those 55 percent under 30 that are going to be empowered. The ones holding the strings now—because of the way the Iranian economy works—are the generals, are the clerics. They are the ones that have taken over the companies.

When you have got \$60 billion to \$100 billion, depending upon whose figure you use, and you lift the escrow on that and that money goes back to Iran, it is their accounts that it is going to go into, and they are going to control the contracts going forward.

How is that going to liberalize the economy or work to the benefit of the next generation in Iran? No, it makes it more certain that the tyranny that this theocracy imposes is going to be strengthened.

We reverse decades of bipartisan U.S. policy; we remove the Security Council resolutions against Iran's illicit nuclear program, and we okay Iran as a nuclear threshold state. That is what has been done here.

You and I know that, once that process is underway, Iran is going to produce nuclear weapons on an industrial scale when they are at the end of

that process, unless they cheat before they get to the end of the process.

Secretary Kerry had previously said we do not recognize Iran's right to enrich and that there is no right to enrich in the NPT. However, this agreement legitimizes Iran's vast nuclear program, including its right to enriched uranium, which can be used to produce a nuclear warhead.

I guarantee you that everybody in the region is going to be looking at that and saying: We want the same agreement Iran had. We want that same exemption to the NPT.

After the agreement's temporary limits expire, Iran's nuclear program will be treated in the same manner as that of any other nonnuclear weapon state party to the NPT. Okay, so we are going to treat Iran like it is Holland, but it is not Holland. It has been caught cheating. That is why we are here. It has been caught cheating in the past, over and over, on their agreements.

Iran can have a peaceful nuclear program without the ability to enrich uranium. This is something we all understand. Many countries have this. It is this key bomb-making technology that is so objectionable.

We had no problem with the idea of letting them have a peaceful nuclear program; but why give up the right to enrich? Preventing the spread of this dangerous technology has been the foundation of our nonproliferation policy for decades.

As a result, over 20 countries have peaceful nuclear energy programs without a domestic enrichment program. In fact, buying fuel for nuclear power plants abroad from countries like Russia is much more cost effective than producing it domestically.

You have to ask: Why do they want to produce it domestically? If this agreement is allowed to go forward, the United States will recognize the ability of Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, to enrich uranium.

Despite claims to the contrary, this will set a dangerous precedent; it will greatly undermine longstanding U.S. efforts to restrict the spread of this key bomb-making technology. How can we tell our allies they can't have it if we do this?

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime, which this Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations. We did that in Congress. We pushed this. The billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get will support its terrorist activity, and those billions are just a downpayment.

Under this agreement, European sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the leader of its elite Quds Force—Soleimani, again—are removed, and their job is to export the revolution. That means their job is to export terrorism.

General Dempsey—I will close with this—testified that Iranian militias, such as those trained and equipped by

Soleimani, killed 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq. Removing sanctions on Soleimani and the IRGC is so shocking that, when the deal was first announced, many thought that it was a mistake, thought that that was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, like my vote against the Iraq War, consideration of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is one of the most consequential foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress. After careful consideration I have decided to support the JCPOA because it is the best way forward to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and advance the national security interests of the United States and our allies.

The intent of sanctions and these negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase transparency of their nuclear activities. After reviewing the agreement and its classified documents, participating in classified briefings with Secretaries Kerry, Moniz, and Lew, and listening to the insights of experts on all sides, it is clear that this deal achieves these goals.

The JCPOA will ensure that Iran will not have the materials or capability to build a nuclear weapon and extends the breakout time for building a nuclear bomb from two or three months as it currently stands to at least a year. And if Iran violates the agreement, unprecedented international inspections will ensure we know about it and can automatically reinstate international sanctions.

In contrast, blocking this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent. Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our nation and our allies, including Israel.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending Americans into harm's way. This is undeniably one of those decisions.

Under the JCPOA, every option is—and will remain—on the table, including military force. But as a Member of Congress I have a solemn obligation to ensure every diplomatic avenue is exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq War and why I support the JCPOA.

This is a pivotal moment. We must certainly remain vigilant in the years and decades to come to ensure the deal is strictly enforced and that Iran upholds its end of the bargain, but the terms of this agreement are strong, verifiable, and long-lasting.

The JCPOA is certainly not perfect, but perfect is not an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative—yet no such alternative has been put forward.

While the risks of a nuclear armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal. This agreement is the best option available and it has my full support.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to House Resolution 3461, the to Approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna

on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The President's failed legacy to execute a strategy of peace through strength has resulted in mass murders throughout the Middle East. We have seen his failure to take action after Syria violated the President's declared "red line" and used chemical weapons against its citizens. We have seen it in his failure to recognize ISIL/DAESH as a significant threat to Americans, not as the "JV" team. When it comes to Middle East policy, the President has been dangerously inaccurate, putting American families at risk.

In South Carolina's Second District, I hosted three town hall meetings on the deal, and the response from my constituents was overwhelming—the American people know this deal is dangerous in the tradition of Neville Chamberlain.

This week's vote on the Iranian nuclear deal is of historic proportions. If allowed, this deal would economically and militarily reenergize a regime bent on the destruction of democracy all over the world. It will put the young people of Iran who seek change at risk. We must act immediately to stop this deal and vote against the Resolution of Approval.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin with a couple quotes from the President about the agreement:

"There is nothing more important to our security and to the world's stability than preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

"It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency."

Mr. Speaker, you would be forgiven if you thought I was quoting President Obama. However, I was quoting President Bill Clinton lauding his nuclear agreement with North Korea in 1994. Additionally he stated, "This agreement will help to achieve a longstanding and vital American objective: an end to the threat of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, we now know that reality turned out to be very different. Despite assurances from President Clinton, the North Koreans violated the deal, began a clandestine program to enrich uranium and in 2006 conducted its first underground test of a nuclear weapon.

Once again we are told by a Democrat President that an agreement will prevent an adversarial country from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We would be fools to believe that they will not violate the Obama agreement just as North Korea violated the Clinton agreement. The stakes here are even higher. Iran is a regime that will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to achieve its long-stated goals: the destruction of both Israel and America.

The Iran Nuclear Deal that was agreed to by President Obama is wholly inadequate and unacceptable. The deal gives up-front, permanent sanctions relief to the Iranian mullahs and allows Iran to have an internationally recognized nuclear program after 15 years that could quickly produce a nuclear weapon.

Most laughable are the "anytime, anywhere" inspections. In fact, the agreement grants the Iranians 24 days to allow the IAEA access to undeclared nuclear facilities. This gives Iran ample opportunity to cheat and continue its march toward a nuclear weapon. We have

also learned that the Iranians will be able to provide their own samples from their military base at Parchin to international inspectors. This is essentially asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

I also have great concerns about what happens once sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars are flowing back into Iran. While the UN Security Council resolutions allegedly prevent Iran from shipping arms to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Assad in Syria, nothing prevents them from sending money. In an incredibly dangerous concession, the U.S. even agreed to shorten the length of the arms embargo against Iran. There is no question that this will negatively impact regional stability as well as the U.S. Navy's access to the Persian Gulf. An article in the Washington Post pointed out that the funds available to Iran immediately upon implementation of this deal would equate to approximately 10% of its GDP. That would be equivalent to a \$1.7 trillion injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this agreement will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I believe it will do just the opposite. In no way should a country that vows to wipe Israel off the map and chants "Death to America" be allowed nuclear capabilities. Today marks a turning point for the future of one of our greatest allies, Israel. If this deal goes through, President Obama and Democrats in Congress will own the consequences of allowing the Iranian regime to become a nuclear power.

We can and must have a better deal. A deal that truly allows for anytime/anywhere inspections. A deal that would keep restrictions on Iran's nuclear program for decades. A deal that forces Iran to end its missile development program. A deal that allows Iran truly limited enrichment capability. A deal that releases U.S. hostages in Iran. It is a catastrophic failure that President Obama did not insist on these provisions in the nuclear deal. We should be embarrassed that as the leader of the free world and the most powerful country on earth, this is the best deal President Obama could negotiate.

We have been presented with a false choice of accepting this deal or going to war. We should reject this deal and return to work, not to war. We cannot allow the sanctions to be lifted, we must reject approval of the deal and we must have all the information—including side agreements—before the clock can begin on the deal. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally Israel and with the American people. The consequences of these votes are truly life and death.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, an Iran with a nuclear weapon would present an existential threat to Israel, destabilize the region and undermine U.S. security interests. This agreement is our best option for avoiding such a scenario. If Congress rejects this agreement, there is a high probability Iran will continue developing weapons grade plutonium and uranium.

That could result in American military action—something I believe we should avoid—and that the American people oppose. A U.S. strike would be costly, causing loss of life on both sides—and could lead to attacks on Israel. Yet, it would only postpone Iran's nuclear weapons development by a few years.

Clearly, a strong, enforceable diplomatic solution is superior. Let's be clear—this agree-

ment is enforceable. The monitoring and inspection provisions are more intrusive than any previous agreement. Most importantly, they will prevent Iran from producing fissionable material without the international community knowing.

There are some who suggest that even with this agreement Iran might still acquire nuclear weapons in the long term. While some provisions of this agreement are indeed time limited and the world will need to revisit this issue, this agreement remains our best chance of thwarting the immediate threat. Many estimates suggest Iran is two to three months away from acquiring a nuclear weapon—and this agreement addresses that very imminent threat.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents on all sides of the issue. I respect the opinions of those who do not support it. However, I believe this agreement is our best option.

Support the agreement. Vote yes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise after careful consideration and review of the Joint-Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and would like to extend my full support of the deal negotiated between Iran and the P5+1 countries. This historical agreement between the United States, China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, plus Germany, is in the best interest of our country, our major ally in the Middle East, and the global community.

The agreement, which will face Congressional scrutiny, has won endorsement by more than one hundred former American diplomats. The group that contains Republicans and Democrats described the deal, negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Energy Dr. Ernest J. Moniz as a "landmark agreement." It would make no sense to reject this diplomatic movement towards stability and peace in the region.

Twenty-nine top American scientists have also endorsed the deal, noting that it will "advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East, and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements." The group of scientists includes six Noble Laureates. In a letter to President Barack Obama, they pointed out that Iran was only "a few weeks away" from having fuel for nearby weapons. The agreement would stop Iran's nuclear program, the scientists wrote.

In the JCPOA, Iran agrees that it will not develop or acquire a nuclear weapon. The deal also includes a permanent ban on Iran's development of key nuclear weapon components and is based on four clear objectives; blocking the highly enriched uranium route, allowing no path to plutonium, intensive monitoring, and incentives for compliance.

Without the agreement, there will be no restraints on Iran's nuclear program. There will more than likely be an arms race to acquire and develop nuclear weapons by various nations in the Middle East. Such a climate would not be in the best interest of our country, and certainly not in the best interests of our ally, Israel, and the global community.

It is my firm belief that if this deal is not implemented due to a Congressional blockade, we risk devastating military conflict. I am hopeful that we can continue on this trajectory of peace and diplomacy as opposed to an unavoidable nuclear arms race and armed conflict in the region. As we move to the next phase and allow Congress to study and de-

bate this agreement, we must listen to the non-proliferation experts who have worked tirelessly to move the deal forward. I urge my Congressional colleagues to support the deal. It would be negligent to walk away from a nuclear deal at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 2100

IN MEMORY OF ELANOR BENSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized as the designee of the majority leader for half of the time remaining before 10 p.m., approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), my good friend.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I thank my friend from Arizona for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having a really great conversation here, and I hope that everyone who has the responsibility of casting a vote on this so-called deal that the President has brought us has been listening very closely.

Mr. Speaker, the President wants Congress to approve what I would call an absurd deal that eases the path for an avowed enemy of the United States of America's and our allies to unleash a nightmare on the world.

I want us to take a look—and I ask the supporters of this deal to take a look—at what Iran has done to merit our trust.

We first saw these guys way back in the Carter administration when they stormed our American Embassy and took our people hostage and held those people for, I believe it was, 42 days. They abused them in every way they could think of. Quite honestly, they finally released them after pressure was placed on them. Since that time, I cannot think of a single instance where dealing with Iran has been a positive thing. In fact, let's look at the public face they put on.

They still chant “death to America.” I heard them chant “death to America” last night on television and “death to Israel,” one of our allies. They still support terror groups, and we just heard from the chairman of the committee of all of the terror groups that they will be able to support after this deal is done. They are still governed by cabal fanatics who are hell-bent on spreading their perverted view of their faith.

Now, is this a nation we should choose to strike a deal with—to make a nuclear deal?

To those people who say they support this, I would like you to make sure you have confidence in the people we are making a deal with. I don’t know what the rest of the world calls a deal, but, generally, when you are making a deal, both sides have some kind of benefit. I can see all kinds of things that we are giving to these folks, to Iran, including a big bucketful of money—billions of dollars. Basically, we have given them everything that they desired as far as going forward. Our inspections are questionable.

My question is: What is the United States of America getting out of this deal?

We are getting a promise from a regime that has a long history—almost 50 years—of lying whenever it serves their purpose. We are taking their word that they are going to do certain things, and we are getting nothing else from this bill but their word.

Think about the cost if this is not the right deal. Those of you who are really thinking about America, think about the cost. To make a mistake on this vote is, quite honestly, catastrophic. Then there is the horror that would come to pass if they actually were to detonate a nuclear device if, for some reason, our failure to do the right thing caused them to get on the fast track to get their hands on it. The blood will be on the hands of those who didn’t take the time to decide: Are these trustworthy people for us to be dealing with? I would argue, they have no track record by which to argue that they are trustworthy.

Tomorrow’s vote is probably as important a vote as anyone in this Chamber will ever take because it is a vote that could unleash nuclear war in the Middle East as a result of our failure to cut a real deal. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think about this—to stand with America, to stand with Israel, to stand with those who oppose state sponsors of terrorism, and to oppose President Obama’s irresponsible and dangerous Iran agreement.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank Judge CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, this is something I, actually, have never done; but have you ever had one of those moments in your life when you want to come to the microphone and share it with whom-ever is willing to listen?

This has been a tough few days here. Many of us, as we come to these micro-

phones, have these heavy hearts because we are fearful that what is going on around us may be one of those momentous moments where we remember this for the rest of our lives, where it is one of those votes—one of those debates—where you affect the world. There is another side to this on a personal basis where you realize how incredibly honored, lucky, blessed you are to get to be behind this microphone.

Last week, a woman from my community passed away. We all in our lives have those handfuls of people who actually make a difference and affect our lives. She is partially responsible for my being behind this microphone.

A woman named Elanor Benson, from Fountain Hills, died last week—I believe at age 95—and she changed my life. I was a 20-, 21-, maybe 22-year-old kid. I was selling real estate in our little town as a way to finance my way through Arizona State University at night. She, in her retirement at that age, decided to take on another job at our little office.

She sat me down, and she knew I had an interest in conservative politics. I still to this day remember her looking at me and saying: “DAVID, I like you. You are going to be the next president of the local Republican club.” I tried to explain to her there was no way I would have time for such a thing, and she looked at me and said: “Don’t worry. I will help.”

This is a woman who moved to our little community on the side of Scottsdale, I believe, in the late seventies, and had such an impact. For years, I used to believe maybe a third of the town—half the town—had become involved in politics, mostly Republican politics, because of her passion, her energy. You could not stop her.

She got me to be president of the local club and stood by me when I did dumb things and applauded me when I did good things and scolded me when I didn’t say the right things and walked me through how to be more sensitive instead of being so caffeinated, which is a family problem.

I realized, in the chaos of doing this job, that I failed to tell her how much I loved her and how much she affected my life, because I don’t believe I would be here today if it weren’t for Elanor Benson, who not only changed my life but who, actually, I believe—with her work at the Fountain Hill Chamber of Commerce, her work for so many causes, her work for her church—made my community a much, much better place. We are all better in our part of Arizona because of her life. It was a life well lived. It was a long life. She was beautiful to the day she passed, and I wish I had let her know how much we cared.

So, Elanor, if you are out there, thank you. Thank you for changing my life. Thank you for making my community a better one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN MEMORY OF HELEN BURNS JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, Scripture says that you shall know the tree by the fruit that it bears. A good tree bears good fruit. Strong trees bring forth strong fruit. Loving trees bear loving fruit.

Mr. Speaker, what then is to be said about a tree whose fruit is a respected and courageous freedom fighter?

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of a great woman of distinction, Helen Burns Jackson, the mother of renowned Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Sr., who is the founder of the Rainbow PUSH Coalition that is based in the First Congressional District of Illinois.

□ 2115

Mother Burns Jackson, Mr. Speaker, was the epitome of a strong, good, fruit-bearing tree.

She made her transition from life to eternity on September 7, 2015, after a lengthy illness. She was surrounded by her loving family and her friends.

A native of Greenville, South Carolina, Ms. Burns Jackson instilled in her children a sense of dignity, self-respect, and loving justice in the face of the inhumane treatment of African Americans in the segregated South.

Born in 1925, she endured the hardships of poverty, the hardships of racism, to raise two sons of great accomplishment, great distinction, an American hero and civil rights legend, the Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Senior, and the Motown music phenomenon Charles Jackson. A gifted singer of world renowned.

Mrs. Burns Jackson herself was a singer and dancer, and she passed on a scholarship to a great college to raise her two sons.

Her life, Mr. Speaker, was the quintessential American story of overcoming the odds with an unbreakable will and a deep, abiding faith.

She planted the seeds of courage, the seeds of perseverance, and the seeds of hope in Reverend Jackson and in his brother, Charles.

Reverend Jackson would go on to not only free American hostages, but became the freedom fighter for those who are oppressed and those who are poor all around this globe.

It is on this very day, September 10, 2015, that I rise before the House of Representatives to pay tribute to this beautiful and extraordinary Movement mother.

Mrs. Jackson was a cosmetologist by profession, and she was known as a towering pillar of her community. Her home became the central station of the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, she often provided me with great encouragement when she traveled to Chicago to visit her son and his family.

As a young activist, I certainly was inspired by her words of wisdom. As a young activist, she inspired me to commit myself to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that trees are the Earth's endless efforts to nurture life. Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson was a beautiful tall tree among all of us who has returned to the heavenly glory of her God, our God Almighty.

Her spirit lives not only in her children, her grandchildren, and in her great-grandchildren, but her spirit also lives in the righteous fruits that may be found in those of us who were touched by the endless love, the great kindness, the great grace, and the tremendous wisdom of Ms. Helen Burns Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District and on behalf of my loving wife, Carolyn, we pay tribute to this remarkable and special woman, this great tree, this inspiration to all of us, Ms. Helen Burns Jackson. She is indeed a mother of the movement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful tribute from a man that knows courage. He has it, he has shown it, and he knows what it is to stand up for what he believes in.

A lot of great examples have served in this body, and that is what we need right now. We face as important an issue as we have had, certainly since I have been here, and possibly decades.

A deal with the devil is what it comes down to, a deal with what Ronald Reagan would say is evil. It makes the evil empire of the Soviet Union pale in comparison to the evil that Iran's leaders have perpetuated, and this administration has done a deal with them.

Chairman ED ROYCE has eloquently pointed out that Iran has violated every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

So wouldn't it fill the definition of insanity if another deal is entered by what used to be the lone superpower with the one and only country in existence right now in the world that has broken every agreement it has entered since 1979?

If someone were standing back as a historian and looking at what is going on right now and were totally objective, he or she would probably say: Well, it looks like the fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. They have made a deal with sheer evil. These evil leaders have lied. They have broken every agreement they have ever entered, and these fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. It is

going to happen again. People are going to die in greater numbers than ever before.

What grieves me more than anything is what seems to be the idea of some in the House and Senate that: Gee, since Iran is going to get nuclear weapons, surely they are going to cheat. They are going to get them. They are going to get them sooner rather than later. This deal is not going to allow anybody to stop them.

So what is important here is to provide political cover to Republicans. We can do that by acting like we are fighting real hard in the House, acting like we are fighting real hard in the Senate. Then we lose.

Then when Iran gets nukes and kills hundreds of thousands or millions of people, you say: See, we told you. We did what we could. But the trouble is that is not good enough because lives in this country and in the nation of Israel are all at stake here.

We have been told that: Gee, the 15 nations heading up the U.N. Security Council, they have agreed; so, it should be binding against the United States.

That argument was attempted to be made by the Secretary of State and the President himself, that: Gee, we have to go along because the U.N. has already voted.

Well, yeah, that would be true if there were not something called the United States Constitution under which our first President under the Constitution took office in 1789.

And since this has been in effect—our U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2, second paragraph, has been in effect, he, talking about the President, shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treatise, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It is very clear.

And we also know it is very clear that you cannot have a treaty like the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The international agreement that was lauded by so many over such a long period of time—you cannot amend an international treaty like that unless it is with another treaty. You cannot amend that with an executive agreement. You cannot amend that with an agreement that is nonbinding.

Therefore, it is exceedingly clear that what the President and Secretary Kerry and Wendy Sherman that did such a good job helping with the North Korea deal so they got nuclear weapons—they say it is not a treaty. But absolutely it is a treaty.

So if we are going to uphold our oath of office, we have to acknowledge that this is a treaty and implore the Senate to announce that, even though the President has not submitted this treaty to them for ratification under Article II, since it is a treaty, they had the power to bring it up.

And, yes, there is a convenient Senate rule called cloture that HARRY REID actually suspended numerous times in the matter of some confirmations so they could get judges on the bench that

would uphold whatever interpretation of the Constitution this administration cared to bring before them.

But there is a time when the Republicans in the Senate must say: You know what. This is too important to let a gaggle of minority Senators from the minority party keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. We are not going to let a rule that we make, that we put in place, that we can suspend, keep us from having a vote on the most important bill of our time, the treaty with Iran.

So the Senate can suspend, as HARRY REID did, the cloture rule with a vote of 51 Senators. Once they have the 51 that suspend cloture in this Iranian treaty, then bring the treaty to the floor for a ratification vote, it will not get two-thirds.

And then, once and for all time, it will be clear to everyone, except perhaps the President and Secretary Kerry—it will be very clear, as it is to constitutional law professors I have talked to—that we are not bound by the Iranian treaty with the only country in the world that has broken every international agreement they have had since 1979.

□ 2130

The resolution that I had filed with numerous great cosponsors, it points out that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015—that is the Corker-Cardin bill—does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran—that is the Iran treaty—submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, because the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a treaty, and pursuant to article II of the United States Constitution, the Senate must give its advice and consent to ratification if the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is to be effective and binding upon the United States.

It also states—because it is a fact—on March 11, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry, in describing the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran, clearly stated that it was “not negotiating a legally binding plan” with Iran, and therefore, it does not have to be submitted to Congress.

If it were not legally binding, then, no, Secretary Kerry and the President do not have to submit it to Congress; but the President and the Secretary of State have already given this facade, this charade away because they have already said: Well, gee, if Congress doesn't go along with it, we will be in breach of the agreement because the U.N. has already voted on it.

A-ha. You said it wasn't legally binding what you were negotiating, and now, you are telling us that is not true.

I mean, it conjures up memories of other statements like: “If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep it.” It conjures up sermons by this administration and this President how we had to take out Qadhafi out of Libya for stability of the area, that it would

make the place so much better in North Africa.

We saw what happened. Qadhafi would not have been removed without President Obama bombing on behalf of the rebels that were infused with al Qaeda that would end up ultimately attacking our consulate in Benghazi and killing four Americans.

We now see, as I did last week when I was in north Africa, this President, this State Department have created massive instability across north Africa. It has put tens of millions of people in fear. What do you think this crazy migration started from?

It started from the policies of this President in declaring that something that they love calling the Arab Spring but ended up becoming a cold, harsh killer of a winter was going to be helped along by the United States.

Some in north Africa reminded me of our President's statement that President Mubarak had to go. The President declared he has to go. He interfered with what was going on in Egypt. He interfered with an ally, not a great guy at all. He created massive instability that allowed the Muslim Brother Morsi to take over. Yes, he was elected. Yes, as confirmed again this past week, there were plenty of fraudulent votes. He alleged to have 12 million or so votes.

After a year as President of usurping the power under the Constitution, totally disregarding the Constitution, taking powers that weren't his, moving to become dictator, over 30 million Egyptians rose up, went to the street. These were moderate Muslims; these were secularists, Christians, Jews that came to the streets and said, with one accord, one heart, one voice: We don't want radical Islamists running Egypt.

Our Muslim friends in Afghanistan in the Northern Alliance said the same thing. We don't want radical Islamists running Afghanistan, but the Egyptian people did it on their own. It may have been the greatest peaceful—it was the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of man. There have never been that many people peacefully demonstrating.

What was not peaceful was the Muslim Brotherhood because they want the world caliphate. They thought they were on the way with the help of President Obama. They were taking Libya. They felt like they were taking Algeria, Tunisia, and come on around north Africa and the Middle East, they were on their way to that world caliphate they were promising they would have, the same world caliphate that the former adviser to the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the United States tweeted out after another American had his head cut off that the international caliphate was inevitable, Americans just needed to get used to the idea, a man that I had been warning was a Muslim Brother and was a top adviser in this administration and needed to be out.

Finally, after he made it clear to even the most dense in this administra-

tion that he was in favor of an international caliphate, finally, they had to let him finish his term and let him go by retiring.

Well, the President is still getting that kind of advice, and the truth is that it is a disaster. It has done so much damage to this country. Those who say this is a great deal are the same people that said we had to remove Qadhafi. It created massive instability. It created a situation where you have so many deaths as people try to flee from north Africa.

Where do you think they are coming from? What do you think laid the groundwork for this? It was this President's intervention in Libya, this President's meddling in Egypt.

We heard the President himself say on national television—international television because ISIS heard it, that ISIS is junior varsity, they are JV. I played on the JV, and I played on the varsity, and there is a vast difference. ISIS knew there was a difference. This President did not.

He said, if we could just arm the vetted moderate Syrian rebels, that everything would be fine in Syria. We have seen that he has created more chaos. He has created tens of thousands of more refugees because of his failed policies born out of massive ignorance—or somebody that is advising him is not ignorant, they know what they are doing—but it is setting the Middle East and north Africa, figuratively speaking, on fire and, in many cases, literally speaking.

We heard over and over of instances where the President's vetted moderate Syrian rebels that we spent millions and millions and millions of dollars training and arming, they kept having all that incredibly upgraded equipment taken over by ISIS. I have been over there. I met with the Kurdish commanders. They are begging for up-armored equipment so they can at least have some way to stay on the battlefield with ISIS that this President has armed through the so-called vetted Syrian moderate rebels.

Well, we heard tonight that Madeleine Albright thinks this is a good deal. Well, wow, I feel so much better that Secretary Albright that said, along with Wendy Sherman, that helped negotiate the deal with Iran, that, Gee, the key to keeping North Korea from having nuclear weapons is to give them nuclear power plants, give them the nuclear material they need because they are willing to promise, in writing, that they won't develop nuclear material or nuclear weapons if we will do all that for them. Well, that didn't work out so well.

People advising this President that were part of the advice—and we hear Madeleine Albright thinks that is a good deal? Then if there was any doubt in any Republican's mind—I don't think there is—but any doubt in any Republican's mind just how horrendous this deal is, that had to be completely dispelled tonight when we heard from

our friend on the Democratic side that Hank Paulson, the former Secretary of the Treasury, thinks this is the thing to do.

This is the guy that gave us TARP. This is the guy that said when we asked, Well, if you don't know how much mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion, and in our conference call with other Republicans, the answer to that question was, Well, we just needed a really big number.

That is the guy that we are told, tonight, is assuring us that this deal with Iran is the way to go.

On August 6, 2015, White House press secretary Josh Earnest, at a White House press briefing, stated: "We don't need Congress to approve this Iran nuclear deal."

On July 28, 2015, Secretary Kerry, at a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated the reason why the Iran nuclear agreement is not considered a treaty is because it has become physically impossible to pass a treaty through the United States Senate anymore. It has become impossible to schedule. It has become impossible to pass.

Two days after Secretary Kerry testified to that, that that was the reason he didn't bring this treaty as a treaty, well, the United States formally ratified the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material when Henry S. Ensher, the Department of State's Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, delivered the United States' instruments of ratification to the IAEA. Whoops—it turns out Secretary Kerry's testimony was not true. I don't think he lied. I just think he was that ignorant.

On June 4, 2015, less than 2 months before Secretary Kerry testified it had become physically impossible for the Senate to ratify treaties, he stated the Department of State is "preparing the instruments of ratification of several important treaties" and that he wants "to personally thank the U.S. Congress for their efforts on the implementing legislation for the nuclear securities treaties."

Well, I don't think he was lying or ignorant. I just think he forgot that he had just thanked us for passing these treaties—or at least the Senate for ratifying these treaties. He forgot that he had just done that when he said it is physically impossible to ratify a treaty anymore.

May 7, 2015, the Senate held a vote on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, commonly referred to as the Corker-Cardin bill, in which every Senator voted on that bill with the understanding that the Iran nuclear agreement was an executive agreement, not a treaty, and the United States' sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program would remain in place.

The Corker-Cardin bill actually states:

It is the sense of Congress that United States sanctions on Iran for ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States.

The Corker-Cardin bill was intended as a review of the application of statutory sanctions against only Iran's nuclear program. The Corker-Cardin bill prescribes a process for congressional review only of "agreements with Iran related to the nuclear program of Iran."

Under subsection (b) and (c) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, lawmakers may resolve to approve, disapprove, or take no action on nuclear agreements with Iran.

Under section 135(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, it calls for "congressional oversight of Iranian compliance with nuclear agreements."

It is pretty easy to recall for those of us with a half-decent memory that actually, under the bill, the treaty being proposed by this administration, the Iran treaty actually doesn't allow Congress oversight.

□ 2145

Not only does it not allow Congress the oversight, it says the IAEA is going to have oversight, not Congress, and we don't even know the arrangement that has been negotiated or is being negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

But we do know this. My friends across the aisle said in debate today—and I was amazed that this statement would be made—that if Iran cheats, we will know it. That was a quote from one of my friends across the aisle.

Well, if Iran cheats, we won't know it. We don't even know if the IAEA has a decent agreement. But we know this. Iran has made clear they will not allow the IAEA inspectors to go to their military sites. They made that clear in every communication they have had since this treaty came forward. And then we find out, actually, Iran has said: We are going to provide samples to you.

Oh, so, as my Democratic friend said, if Iran cheats, we will know it. What that means is when Iran cheats, they are going to bring samples from the area they won't let the IAEA inspect and say: Here are the samples that let you know we cheated, because our Democratic friends in Congress knew if we cheated, we would let you know we are cheating.

Seriously? Is that how naive this government has gotten?

We were told in debate by a Democratic friend that it would have been a mistake to demand the release of U.S. hostages. Oh, yeah, that would have been a mistake, that before we enter any negotiation, they have to show good faith by releasing the hostages so that we know that they are a country with whom we can deal? Of course that was the right thing to do.

And \$100 billion to \$150 billion going to Iran under this deal is more money

than we have given or used to help Israel with since Israel came into being again in the late 1940s. And yet we are going to give it not to our close ally Israel. We are going to give it to their worst enemy that has even said this past week that they were plotting to overthrow Israel. This week they have said that they are plotting to overthrow Israel, and they are coming for the United States.

I have heard people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, wrongly compare Neville Chamberlain to the current situation that the President and Secretary Kerry have proposed. I would submit that that is a grossly unfair comparison for Neville Chamberlain, because at the time Neville Chamberlain had that paper that he got Hitler to sign that caused him to say, "This is peace for our time"—a lot of papers messed it up and said "peace in our time"; he said "peace for our time"—at the time Chamberlain did that, Hitler had not violated every international agreement he had entered. He hadn't done that. Iran has.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said, "This is peace for our time," Hitler had not been saying, "Death to England"; "death to France"; "death to the countries in Europe." He had not been saying that. Iranian leaders have been, including the Ayatollah.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said this agreement means "peace for our time," Hitler had not publicly stated he was plotting the overthrow of any of the countries in the area. Iran has. They are plotting the overthrow of Israel and to take out the United States.

Our friend TOM COLE said in the Rules Committee this week that he was concerned that this agreement will cause an arms race, and he is exactly right. That was confirmed again this past week as I was over there talking to people that know in the Egyptian Government.

The Saudis are already working a deal to buy nukes. The Saudis know they have got to have them because Iran is going to have them under this Iranian treaty if we don't stop the treaty.

You stop the treaty by the Senate voting on it as a treaty and not getting to two-thirds. That means it is not binding against the United States. Other countries in the area—Jordan, Egypt, even Libya, Lebanon, and all these countries—know they are going to have to have nukes if they are going to survive the area.

It is going to create the proliferation of nuclear weapons like there has never been in the world. And as someone said, mutually assured destruction with Russia was a deterrent, but with Iran, it is an incentive.

This is such a dangerous time. But the Iranian treaty amends the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in several places. You can't amend a treaty unless you are amending it with another treaty.

This is a treaty the Senate needs to step up and say it is a treaty. And for heaven's sake, this is far more important a situation where we suspend the cloture rule so that we do not allow a small segment of radicals supporting Iran to keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. And then vote, and when you don't get two-thirds it is not ratified.

What the House is doing this week is actually not a bad strategy for the House because, as a treaty, we don't get a vote. But if we stand idly by and let the President treat it as if it has been ratified, then Israel will have to defend itself. Under the Iranian treaty, we will have to defend Iran, not Israel, and the unthinkable will happen, and that is the United States and Iran will be on the same side against Israel. We have got to stop that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security; in addition, to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2654. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Mergers, Consolidations, and Charter Amendments of Banks or Associations (RIN: 3052-AC72) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2655. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David A. Dunaway, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2656. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William M. Faulkner, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2657. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas J. Robb, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2658. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Theodore C. Nicholas, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2659. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark F. Ramsay, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2660. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-AJ10) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2661. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2662. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Moises Deltoro III and Captain Cedric E. Pringle, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2663. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General James C. Slife, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and Colonel Paul E. Bauman, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2664. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Inventory of Contracted Services for Fiscal Year 2014 report for the Military Departments, De-

fense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2665. A letter from the Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards [Regulation H, Docket No.: R-1498] (RIN: 7100 AE-22) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2666. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Updating Regulations Governing HUD Fees and the Financing of the Purchase and Installation of Fire Safety Equipment in FHA-Insured Healthcare Facilities [Docket No.: FR-5632-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ27) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2667. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2015-2017 Enterprise Housing Goals (RIN: 2590-AA65) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2668. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Derivatives (RIN: 3133-AD90) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2669. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Chartering and Field of Membership Manual (RIN: 3133-AE31) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting a letter stating that the National Telecommunications and Information Administration intends to exercise the first option in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions contract to extend the period of performance for one year to September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2671. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2014-C-1552] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2672. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Twentieth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to Sec. 1810 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "2014/2015 Economic Dispatch and Technological Change" report to Congress, in response to Secs. 1234 and 1832 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2674. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of

Defense, transmitting Reports for the third quarter of FY 2015, April 1, 2015 — June 30, 2015, developed in accordance with Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214) are provided by request; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2675. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-50; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2676. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions [Docket No.: 140613501-5698-02] (RIN: 0694-AG13) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 7, 2015 Extension of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 150813713-5713-01] (RIN: 0694-AG71) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2678. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report as required by Sec. 181 of the 1992-93 Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Pub. L. 102-138, concerning Employment of U.S. Citizens by Certain International Organizations in 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2679. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2680. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Recreational Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna [Docket No.: 150305219-5619-02] (RIN: 0648-BE78) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2681. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 150619537-5615-01] (RIN: 0648-BF19) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2682. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE007) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2683. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Revision to Prohibited Species Regulations [Docket No.: 150112035-5658-02] (RIN: 0648-BE80) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2015 Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 150316270-5662-02] (RIN: 0648-XD843) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's emergency rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibited Species Catch; Emergency Rule [Docket No.: 150629564-5564-01] (RIN: 0648-BF24) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2686. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the report "Tribal Crime Data Collection Activities, 2015", as required by Sec. 302(g) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3732(g), as added by Sec. 251(b)(5) of the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Title II of Pub. L. 111-211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2687. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Denied Access to NASA Facilities (2015-N002) (RIN: 2700-AE14) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2688. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (RIN: 2700-AE18) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2689. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Allocation of W-2 Wages in a Short Taxable Year and in an Acquisition or Disposition [TD 9731] (RIN: 1545-BM11) received September 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2690. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Mission Support Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Duty Free Entry of Space Articles [Docket No.: NASA-2015-0006] (RIN: 2700-AD99) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2691. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's "2015 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program", pursuant to Sec. 231 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114-260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3470. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 3471. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the provision of automobiles and adaptive equipment by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the provisions of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, to raise the threshold dollar amount of contracts subject to the prevailing wage requirements of such provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit limitations on certain grants due to standards for covered farm vehicles and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3474. A bill to establish additional protections and disclosures for students and co-signers with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms.

BASS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assist in the support of children living in poverty by allowing a refundable credit to grandparents of those children for the purchase household items for the benefit of those children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for an increase in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477. A bill to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478. A bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued management as de facto wilderness areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for developing and implementing plans to address non-point source pollution affecting nationally significant estuaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3480. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481. A bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to implement various reforms to the social security disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 3483. A bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from participating in, or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486. A bill to reauthorize and amend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487. A bill to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional sports leagues that use, or promote or allow member teams or franchisees to use, the term "Redskins" or the term "Redskin"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations applicable to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3489. A bill to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 414. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2015 as "Campus Fire Safety Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 415. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that regular order should be restored in the House and Senate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 416. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives recog-

nizing community water fluoridation as one of the great public health initiatives on its 70th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution requesting the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Secretary of State to pursue a multilateral approach to promptly address the potential crisis in the Dominican Republic that could render tens of thousands of Dominicans of Haitian descent stateless; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution reaffirming the friendship between the Commonwealth and Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

" . . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . ."

" . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to reform the Social Security Disability Insurance program. Therefore, it will affect the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the 7 Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 167: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 169: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 191: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 192: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 205: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 206: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 228: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 232: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 239: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 248: Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 282: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 300: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 304: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 342: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 407: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 437: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 448: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 511: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 538: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 540: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 546: Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 556: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 563: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 572: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 583: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 592: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 602: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 605: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 619: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 680: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 691: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 692: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 702: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 703: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 748: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 771: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 775: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 799: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 815: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 828: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 829: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 841: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 863: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R.

H.R. 865: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 879: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 885: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 912: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 928: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 932: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 940: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 969: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VELA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 985: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 990: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1016: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1057: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1062: Mr. TURNER and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1101: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1120: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1185: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1188: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1192: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1218: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1248: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1258: Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1274: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1282: Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1343: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1358: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1384: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1399: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1401: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1439: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1475: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1478: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 1490: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1505: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1528: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1559: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1586: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1602: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1635: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1669: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1684: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1686: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1692: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1718: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1737: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1752: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1779: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1786: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VELA, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1846: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1849: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1856: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1859: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1901: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 1942: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1943: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2043: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2050: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2067: Mr. JONES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 2077: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 2096: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 2142: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2145: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2221: Ms. HAHN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2254: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2264: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2278: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2280: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2293: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2313: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2403: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2404: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 2412: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 2417: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 2477: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2521: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2602: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2653: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 2675: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2694: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2698: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2710: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2713: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2715: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2744: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2764: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2844: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2848: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2850: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2858: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2893: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 2903: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2904: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2911: Mr. WALZ, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 2940: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2948: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2972: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3011: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3013: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 3036: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 3051: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3061: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3064: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3065: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3095: Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3123: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 3134: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3135: Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 3150: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 3151: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 3160: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 3165: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3173: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 3183: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3184: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3185: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3216: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3229: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3250: Mr. LOESBACH.
H.R. 3258: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3261: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3268: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3293: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 3294: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 3296: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3301: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3316: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3337: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3338: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 3341: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 3381: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3412: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3423: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3429: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3431: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3437: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3439: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 3442: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 3444: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 3455: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3457: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3460: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.J. Res. 49: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PALMER.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. HOLDING.

H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 14: Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 54: Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 245: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 371: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 383: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H. Res. 386: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 393: Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.

H. Res. 394: Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WELCH.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3460, To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3460 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3460, "To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant

to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3461, To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3461 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3461, "To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H. Res. 411, "Finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3443: Ms. MCSALLY.